!rritocracy

Noun (n.) A form of governance built not upon fixed authority or finalized truth, but upon the structured response to persistent contradiction, irritation, and unresolved lack within the system. It is a government that institutionalizes critique as its sovereign force.

A Thought Experiment on Imagining an Incomplete Form of Government

Servideus Weissman von Yavaria | Beta-edition | 2025

"*O people, I have been elected as your leader, although I am not the best among you.* ***If I am in the right, then help me. And if I am in the wrong, then set me right***."

— Abu Bakr as-Siddiq RA.

A Snippet from Proudhon's Letter to Marx

…Let us seek together, if you wish, the laws of society, the manner in which these laws are realized, the process by which we shall succeed in discovering them; but, for God's sake, after having demolished all the *a priori* dogmatisms, do not let us in our turn dream of indoctrinating the people.

I applaud with all my heart your thought of bringing all opinions to light; let us carry on a good and loyal polemic; let us give the world an example of learned and far-sighted tolerance, but let us not, merely because we are at the head of a movement, make ourselves the leaders of a new intolerance, let us not pose as the apostles of a new religion, even if it be the religion of logic, the religion of reason. Let us gather together and encourage all protests, let us brand all exclusiveness, all mysticism; let us never regard a question as exhausted, and when we have used our last argument, let us begin again, if need be, with eloquence and irony. On that condition, I will gladly enter your association. Otherwise — no!

I have also some observations to make on this phrase of your letter: *at the moment of action*. Perhaps you still retain the opinion that no reform is at present possible without a *coup de main*, without what was formerly called a revolution and is really nothing but a shock. That opinion, which I understand, which I excuse, and would willingly discuss, having myself shared it for a long time, my most recent studies have made me abandon completely. I believe we have no need of it in order to succeed; and that consequently we should not put forward *revolutionary action* as a means of social reform, because that pretended means would simply be an appeal to force, to arbitrariness, in brief, a contradiction. I myself put the problem in this way: *to bring about the return to society, by an economic combination, of the wealth which was withdrawn from society by another economic combination*. In other words, through Political Economy to turn the theory of Property against Property in such a way as to engender what you German socialists call *community* and what I will limit myself for the moment to calling *liberty* or *equality*. But I believe that I know the means of solving this problem with only a short delay; I would therefore prefer to burn Property by a slow fire, rather than give it new strength by making a St Bartholomew's night of the proprietors ...

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon

Lyon, 17 May 1846

Section 0: The Introduction of Critique and Godelian Legalism

This section is an introduction to Godelian Legalism through a critique of the Philosophy of Law via Godel's Incompleteness Theorem.

Chapter 0: The Nature of Existence, Language, and System

Before we delve into the nature of law, we want to propose a radical way of thinking about it. We envision a legal framework that is never absolute, one that welcomes critique from any party, without collapsing into relativism or being hijacked by bad-faith actors.
But many would find this idea appalling. Why should a constitution—something meant to be a nation's firm foundation—be designed to be incomplete?

For some, critiquing the constitution is akin to injecting chaos into the very structure meant to provide stability. Isn't the purpose of law to prevent precisely that instability?

To respond to these concerns, we begin not with politics, but with mathematics—with Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem. We aim to show that incompleteness is not a defect but a necessary feature of all systems, and more radically, that it is the engine by which systems evolve toward greater coherence.

1. On System and Existence

- Gödel's Theorem as Ontological Metaphor

Godel, in his theorem, proves that any mathematical proposition is either:

- Incomplete but Consistent (it follows a coherent set of rules but cannot prove everything within itself), or
- Complete but Inconsistent (it tries to account for everything but becomes self-contradictory).

He asserts this by inserting a Liar's paradox into the mathematical proposition.

"This Statement is Incorrect."

This statement is paradoxical—it can be either correct or incorrect, but not both. And yet, if it's correct, it contradicts itself; if it's incorrect, it becomes correct. This circularity reveals a truth: no system can prove everything about itself without running into contradiction.

Now, the truth of this statement, while valid within mathematics, cannot be proven from within the system itself. This means that mathematics needs something other than math to explain such a proposition. Why is this important?

This proves two things: (1) Any valid human system is necessarily incomplete yet consistent. (2) If one attempts to create a complete system, it becomes self-referential and ultimately inconsistent—a fundamental logical flaw. How? Well, since the most basic understanding of human knowledge comes from mathematics, however minimal, if then some proposition or a

system can explain some things, one thing it won't be able to explain is how is that a system *can know anything?* In mathematics, for example, 1 is always equal to 1, but the moment you ask 'why', you begin to step outside the realm of mathematics into the realm of philosophy and another system to explain why is that case. The moment you try to explain things, you need to explain why the explanation you give is coherent.

The irony is this: the moment you discover a system that finally were able to explains 'why 1=1 is true', you would then face another contradiction about 'how can we know that *that* system's explanation is correct?' Let's, for example, you find a way to explain why 1=1 via logic itself or empirical observation; a skeptic then might ask: *how can your method account for its own validity?* Then you are faced with another problem of proving why your method is true. At this point, you can stretch it out ad infinitum, and then suddenly you got to the point where every system is inherently incomplete; in the sense that, all possible explanations are contingent upon something else to define our system. The point is this: the moment you explain something, you are left with the problem on *how you would justify your explanation without referring to itself.* Now, why is this a problem? Because it shows that for every knowledge there is, or at least that is known by us, is still not properly based on anything that is absolute. Every identity, knowledge, information, is necessarily incomplete for it to have existed in the first place.

- Infinite Regress and the Structure of Alienation

If every system is contingent upon something outside itself to define it, then even selfhood is compromised from the start. We are all contingent beings, defined through differentiation, through what we exclude in order to form a coherent identity. An existence, therefore, is not absolute in a Cartesian sense; but it is barred from the start of its existence. Imagine for a moment, a quantum particle that is both a particle and a waveform at the same time, until observation collapse that super-state into one of 2 categories. In this case, same can be said with reality and existence, whereby an existence is a collapsed waveform from superpositional reality. An existence (more precisely, an actualization of it), therefore, to use Lacanian words, is both a repression and the return of the repressed. To exist is to alienate; to exclude what-ought-not-to-be something, in order for that something to become what it is. The very definition of system itself – per Luhmann – is an entity in that makes an operational closure with its binary logic, to differentiate its structure with the environment around it; in which the excluded part returns as a noise for a system to self-reproduce itself. In other words, a system needs to differentiate itself from its environment to function. System is a logic that breaks superpositional reality by its binary logic into its own code to function properly; in reality, however, a binary is an illusion in which it is constructed posteriorly by a system to remain coherent.

To put it simply: to explain what a thing is, we unconsciously tries to exclude that *thing* with *what it is not*; the paradox is then, a thing is only a thing inasmuch it is defined by its negation. You cannot say 1=1 anymore: you have to say that 1 is equal to 'not (not-1)'. A thing can only be defined by its exclusion, for it to make sense at all.

To answer Shakespeare, therefore, *it is not that to be or Not to be; but it is* ***To be Is Not to be***. Because for a thing to become itself, it had to be defined by what it had been excluded to remain coherent.

But then a question occurs: if for every existence there is an excluded part for a system to remain coherent, what of it that made the excluded? They are not really 'invisible'; conversely, they are very much existent. The excluded is not merely immaterial; the existence of two objects is very much an exclusion of each other. Here, we can see how the excluded remains a valid object that can be analyzed. But if every exclusion is its system, then what of it if we take it into absurdity? Every exclusion is its own system, which itself is also exclude something that is a system…at the end of it, we will get an infinite regress without an end. This infinite regress—this chain of exclusions—is, in our view, the very engine of existence. To exist is to differentiate. Existence is not a positive fullness but a limited actualization out of infinite potentiality, shaped by exclusions.

One might then say that all of this is just a theoretical discourse that holds no value, when we can in fact, just *do the thing* and *move on without our lives* and so on. Well, it is a valid reaction, but it really is a complicated problem. First, you need to define what the *thing* is, and then *where do you move on?* Then once you got that, you then must justify another question upon question to satisfy a total skeptic like a madman; building question upon question without a stopping point.

Eventually, one might ask absurd questions like:

- Why is quantum foam the ground of all being?
- Why not a ghost? Or a goo substance that makes you a mutant? Or maybe a matrix code of simulation or whatever?

What is the Unconscious of Quantum foam?

These aren't merely jokes. They reveal the deeper problem: even physical reality, like quantum foam, must exclude other possibilities to be coherent. And so, even the bedrock of physics is contingent, alienated, partial. They *need* to alienate in order its forms in other possibilities in order to be coherent enough to function. When even the bedrock of physics itself is an incomplete system; or in other word, a cosmos is as unsure as a subject in a restaurant who chooses burger over sandwich this time when in the past they can choose pasta instead; then we can say that reality itself is absurd, no matter how you would react to it.

This is the logic of alienation as existence: every system is defined by what it leaves out. The thing is, we know a thing, because that thing is *different* and *not something other-than-itself* to become the way it is.

This is not a flaw to be fixed but a fundamental feature of existence. To exist is to differentiate—to exclude what something is not. Every coherent system represses or excludes something in order to maintain its identity. The very structure of reality is formed by repression and exclusion: consciousness (the structured system) exists alongside its unconscious (the repressed remainder

that sustains it). It is not that there is a flaw in which we must traverse to make a structure complete; but this very flaw itself is the engine of evolution of said system. The point is, just like how ourselves would never grow if we never consider ourself to be 'wrong', a system needs its error to receives updates to fix this problem until it then faces another problem to be sublimated within.

You then might ask: *well, surely there got to be a point somewhere*; that would be valid in its own voice; but it is still considered a dogma; in which, ironically again, is all what we got. Not to say that it is *bad* per se[1], but these thought experiments clearly show that our limitation is very much existent, whether or not we admit it. In my view at least, *the point of existence is impossibility itself.* The non-existent of, let's say, God, is the necessity of all these exclusions going on. God, in this view, is not a Being within the system, but the logical excess of the system itself. Not a definable origin, but the very impossibility of closure. This is not nihilism, but metaphysical humility. God is impossible; therefore he is.

What do I mean by that? What I'm saying is, we can change and critique all of which, falls under the realm of system. We can deconstruct anything, explain anything in any way we wish, but we will never be able to explain the source of it all itself. Then for me, it is precisely because of this impossibility of existence, existence itself happen. If there were a fully self-sufficient, logically-contained Ground, we would have no movement, no change, no growth. But because such a Ground is impossible—because the source of all things is unthinkable within the system—existence is propelled forward by its own incompleteness.

The fact that there is no source that is effable within the realm of logic itself, constitutes the logic. The source is not a positive structure that adheres to logic, like some big man in the sky that sit somewhere or something like that, but it is *the logical excess of logic itself, that fails to explain its own source.* As if logic says: *it is impossible for us to describe how we even exists in the first place; because the source are not within us.* Then, the only rationality remains, is to believe that impossibility itself is the source of existence; which is paradoxically, a madness from different perspective you see it. Then from this, an existence is inevitably an alienation; a repression of what ought-to-be-excluded, for it to be coherent in the first place.

- The Myth of Non-System and Finality

Then some of us might say: *well, I don't use any of this 'logic' so I am out of the count;* Some would seek a way to be 'outside' the category itself to decide things, to make things more 'objective' and thus make a 'fairer judgement' about these matters at hand. Then forgive that I say: those who just declare them to be 'outside' categories had just fallen under/conditioned by the very system of 'non-system' itself.
I myself encounter some of the such people who proudly wear the badge of the "non-system": the naïve Deleuzian (in respect to Deleuze and Guattari themselves for their rhizomatic

[1] Even this whole framework itself is a dogma; really, no one are outside the system.

thinking); Anarchist purists, or some postmodernists that are comfortable in their label of 'non-system'. Some of Deluezional might argue, that there is no difference because the 'core' of it all remains the same, yet their structure still change: Just like a musical notes that comes from the same source and thus, are fluid. My point here is, we're not talking about the 'nature' of things here: and even if that is the case, then territorialization of totalitarian state is just one expression of a immanent rhizome that s fluid: which is, although not been explicitly argues, it is implied in most of their argument. What we talk about here, is not the nature *per se*, but rather the structural part that is affecting our lives structurally speaking. To put it into metaphor, there is a bad music that is oftentimes chaotic and hurts people's ears, and there is a good music that heals people. We don't talk about the nature of waveform itself, but rather how they are structured in such a way that is good, or bad, depending on their effects around it. Yes, A minor is not entirely different from G major, since they come from one source, but the structure they produce is entirely different; and this differentiation is still dialectically interact with each other. We're not discussing the source of sound itself, but how notes are structured into songs. And some songs are violent.

Every act of deterritorialization is already a reterritorialization. Every deconstruction, no matter how radical, gives rise to a new construction. The repressed and its return are not opposites, but two expressions of the same systemic rupture.

To take a stance against something is to generate a structure—a framework in which that stance makes sense only by excluding what it opposes. A position never exists in isolation; it is constituted by its difference from what it negates.

No identity, concept, or system is self-contained. Each requires its own outside—its excluded opposite—to exist at all. The moment you register a concept into discourse, it becomes part of a symbolic structure. You know a thing not because it Is, but because you can differentiate it with something else. And yet, those who claim to "escape structure" often remain blind to the fact that they are already structuring their escape—territorializing the very deterritorialization they preach.

What these non-structural absolutists don't realize is that, when they ironically use a system of 'non-system' to attacks other system, they repress critique from outside of their structure behind the wall of outsider naivety, blind to the fact that they themselves are inside the system; just one that is more obscure because they reject a clear structure or hierarchy of dialectics, while acting like *their system is better than those who are targeted towards*. Isn't this is *the* very hierarchy? That one idea is *better* than the other? Some of those would then become dismissive and thus avoiding the discourse with an almost cowardly saying of: 'well, it's all just a narrative'. Then more often than not, I come back dissatisfied with the thought of: *then why the hell we even discussing anything in the first place*?

These kinds of discourse from those who are 'outside' the system then no longer produce a coherent discussion, and this might even result in the birth of Neoliberal justification of alienation, exploitation, and so on. Because for these people, since all of this problem is just a narrative and wordplay, nothing matters. Sure, you don't get to be 'enforced' anymore –you can still speak and have democracy– but since there is no other alternative, a discourse is just a wordplay. A democracy therefore, just become an empty husk that hides an invisible power that

is far more malevolent in its oppression and its alienation – not just in terms of externalized brutalities to the more inferior countries, but to the desensitization of the global populace itself in the face of growing Fascism.
Even more with the Deluezionals who prefer 'pure immanence' and 'rhizome' without even addressing the structural problems they claim to negate and oppose! They are not as better than Hegelian absolutists who dreams of final synthesis that then justifies any Contradiction as 'negated' whole into a higher synthesis. They are the most fervent defender of their own contradiction within their framework by claiming negation of structure as a whole. Maybe even worse: these Deluezional only negate their own material consciousness and replaces it with an illusion of transcendence that only occurs in their own subjectivity, and thus blind to real material Contradiction and offers no viable alternative. These kinds of thoughts only then became commodified and neutered into the discourse of the oppressor that has more advanced organizational ability, that plagues humanity with their systemic alienation for their own gain.

It is ironic considering that an ideologue of non-system that often promotes decentralization and *deterritorialization* of structures; emphasizing *rhizomes* instead of a system without a clear structure, may unknowingly justify the existence of clear alienation that is produced by a system of governance; and thus, any form of radicalization is *neutralized* and even weaponized into the narrative to justify the oppression that is being made by the very structure they oppose.

Take the media: how often do we hear commentators say, “It’s just a misunderstanding”, or “There are many perspectives”? And suddenly the truth of oppression is flattened into relativism. The danger isn’t just in top-down authoritarianism anymore. It’s in scattered, decentralized narratives that bad actors use to justify harm—under the guise of pluralism.
Such is the problem with many of naïve thinkers who thought that they are not subjected to the same logic just because they think (based on the ‘non-system’ they use) that they are ‘outside the system’. Know that the most dangerous subject of an ideologue is the one who think that their insight or system of thought, is not a system and therefore valid: whether it is labelled as reality, fact, revelation, or anything like that. It is a perversion of a thought that falls under the same the logic of the absolutists: that a subject is *transcending* other thought and therefore more legitimate than others; and maybe it is worse, because now rather than top-down structure that we can point to blame our problem upon, now the narratives that are scattered are used by bad actors to justify their act of violence under the guise of ‘pluralism of narratives’.

There are no such thing as ‘outside the system’ or ‘final synthesis’, or anything like that; in fact, it is a pretty illusion that made even some of the great thinkers falls under[2]. That’s why some Sufis, or maybe Heideggerian might chooses to stay silent rather than describe; it is not because they are impaired or whatsoever; the source is too great to be collapsed into a legible form. Just as how wave-particle collapse, where a quantum decoherence alienates its very nature of duality into one of the actualities via posteriori observation, language also, necessarily exclude what ought-not-to-be-said into coherent form. That’s why some people choose silence, but even this silence is in itself is an expression; so it is were insufficient to encapsulate the impossibility. The point is, there are no tangible final answer to these question at hand; you cannot have a final

[2] Some of which include the absolute synthesis of Hegel and his derivatives.

answer that supposedly fixes all of our problem and call it a day. The very notion of 'solution' itself presupposes its negation (problem, alienation), which is, again, incomplete.

2. Critique of Legal System: the Problem of Human System

Then what is this all to do with Legal discussion? To put it simply: my goal is to show that since existence by definition equals to alienation, the possibility of total and perfect system itself is ontologically absurd. There can't be no perfect law that produces utopia or whatsoever. This is because the moment you build, you necessarily exclude the environment around that structure. It is ontologically impossible to propose a perfect system of knowledge, let alone building an utopia upon perfect political structures. Take for example, a law based upon the Divine Order would necessarily exclude the apostate and the sinful; the law based on Socialism would necessarily exclude the wealthy and capitalists; the law based on technocracy would necessarily exclude the tradition, and so on and so on. This shows that every struggle to produce a legal system that is perfect is inherently compromised from the moment you put the first brick of an axiom; because to establish an axiom itself is inherently exclude all other axiom that is not accounted.

Let's say, based on irrationality of human itself, a law must be made to create a stability: a leviathan, so to say. If we strip the ideological or moral justification of an enactment of Law, and observe the structure of the law itself, the ideal would be that a law that is 'complete', in a way that, they take account of all contingencies and variables of chaos, so that stability would then be reached. But such ideal would never be reached, because the existence of Law itself are necessitated by variable outside of its structure: a necessity of an era, society, or so on. So, a law then necessarily incomplete.

But an incomplete law system would be a problem: an incomplete system are imperfect, and this flaw would then must be abolished to create a perfect society. Theorists would then provide for this incompleteness by trying to make an answer that is still inadequate in our view, in the terms of handling the complexities of reality itself.

Now, let's try taking this more seriously as we delve into mainstream foundation of legal system in our world, and reveal its unconscious at hand.

- On Legal Naturalism

Mistakes can be made from assuming that truth can be known and grasped fully within language. This is the core argument for perverse Natural Law, in which laws are absolute because they refers to the nature and what is universally good. Since laws are what are made to preserve the 'nature' of things: morality, divine grace, etc., it must then be obliged absolutely as a fact of the nature itself.

These are correct in the sense that the law must be followed because it is logical and comes from a justified source that is Universal. Since there is a universal good, the assumption is therefore that there must be a logical structure of law that also represents the whole truth; and since a law made by this thought at hand is reflective of nature, it has the same properties as a fact of nature itself. A subject that opposes the Law, therefore, is also opposing the natural order itself, and therefore must be subjected to trials to preserve the stability of the 'natural order'.

The mistake of such a proposition is in assuming that the interpretation of the Law derived from the universal, is also carries the same validity as the Universal itself. Consider this example: A scientist studies the properties of the sun through observation. No matter how exceptional their work is, if they were to claim, 'My work is the sun itself,' they would be ridiculed. That is because the word cannot comprehend reality. From this example, therefore, by assuming that laws are absolute and static just because it is derived from something that is 'perfect', one has mistaken the Reality with the Idea of reality itself. Instead of looking at the sun and saying, 'That is the sun,' a person points to their work—whether a painting or a book—and claims, 'This is the sun.'.

We had discussed that every structure itself is inherently alienated; in this case, the ontological value of legal naturalism is compromised by the fact that it is impossible to create a perfect structure, positively speaking, from an ideal which is inherently impossible. Moreover, the struggle of constructing such a system is presuming that morality and justice have a positive structure which can be replicated and sensed; which is inherently wrong. The conception of justice is differs from one subject to another; so if a law is enacted upon that proposition, instead of replicating a natural order, a governance then become merely a replica of one's desire unto the structure of the law itself, in which it then be enforced upon the subject and thus alienating them.

The values behind such a proposition is themselves, noble. Since nature does its things perfectly, a human, then by decree, must imitate this structure of perfectness into society to acquire the best justice model. The problem that I want to point out is that it lacks the variables of correspondence from reality itself.

If we were to make a law based on this 'natural' proposition, how can we make sure that this law itself corresponds to what reality is? How can we determine and falsify our axioms against which we refer upon? If such problem remains unresolved, then it is easy to imagine and to read upon the history of humanity itself, that a bad ruler may use this very proposition of 'naturalism' to justify their oppression and destruction. Such is the fact of Nazi Germany, in which in order to structurally create a perfect society based on the idea of social Darwinism and 'natural order', inherently create a far more destruction of its environment rather than preserving them as the nature should be about. Same can be said with the Enlightenment colonization, in which, mistaking *rationality* as moral order itself, they began to colonize the southern world with justification of 'making these people civilized'. An oppression became a justification that necessary destruction is required to 'eliminate the plague of society' in which in itself, doesn't correspond with any justified knowledge about nature itself.

- On Theocracy

The same can be said for some of Theologians. For example, in interpreting the Holy Book, they made a mistake by saying that their interpretation of Holy Book, is as Holy as the Holy Book itself. We can see how this is a grave fallacy, in which, a state then can justify their rule and oppression based of that justification, that 'we are representing God in its absoluteness'. Even if this assumption were correct, we would already have a perfect system. Yet the very fact that we are discussing it proves otherwise. A state then, by using the justification of Natural or Theological Law, commit an ontological theft, by confusing the Universal with the Interpretation

of the universal; and then oppress its subject, not only through Force, but also their Mind and Ideologies for confusing truth with falsehood.

The problem that arises therefore, like that of the oppression that had been made by cultists or extremists in enacting their rule with absolute authority without correspondence. In enacting a law with such intensity, more often than not, that there is a result in real casualties, both materially and spiritually. Paradoxically, such zealous country would then produce a subject that seeks freedom from such oppression, and thus oftentimes such country become the biggest importer apostates of its subject from said religion, which is personally concerning for me.

From my point of view as a Muslim, Quran itself is perfect in its from, but its posteriori interpretation cannot be taken as such. The biggest heresy of all is in equating the perfectness of God into that of fallible human that assume that they hold the Truth of the religion and thus can do anything at will to uphold their Truth. In doing so, they had created an Idol that masks itself as Quran, and it is the most abhorrent desecration of the law of God itself. Man suppose to know their limit and had humility in their limitation, and not to act like that of a God upon the earth subconsciously, while promising that what they do is granted by divine will. They are not merely a hypocrite that produce a destruction upon the face of the earth, but desecrating the name of God in the face of His subject; guiding the flocks away from His grace[3]. And when it is said upon them 'do not make a destruction upon the earth', they would say 'but we are the one who are rightful.'; Know that they are the desecrator of the earth but they are not yet realize it.

This is the fate for all absolutists, whether in the name of God or Religion, or also Secularist, in the name of Progress, Philosophy, or Science. To admits that no human knowledge is ever absolute, would save a country from committing this mistake. This is precisely what al-Ghazali had warns the Muslim against the philosophical movement in his age that tries to subsum God into merely a logical function through philosophy.

Transcendence of God should be placed above the fallibility of Human Reasoning; and Justice cannot be given and must be striven towards. It is not through absolute certainty that eludes humanity, that we can reach the realm of the Divine; But it is through humility and doubt in certainty that faith and striving are made to be possible. We don't have faith in God because we can see them; but precisely because He is beyond and impossible that we had put our faith in it.

- On Legal Positivism (Still need an improvement)

A law is a law just because it is a law; therefore it must be obeyed by its subject, because it is The Law. For example, a President or a king, decide a law just because 'I Said So'. The justification became arbitrary. Since the justification is arbitrary, the law it produces holds no more validity than the reasoning of its subjects. If law is arbitrary, then its authority becomes indistinguishable from mere personal preference. If a ruler, that is, human, were able to tell another human, to do what he wants to do because he said so, then by that logic also the subject of the rule can rebel or do what contrary to what supposed to be done. This is the fallacy of those who adheres to Legal Positivism, in a sense that, they argue that the Law must be followed simply because it is the Law; ignoring that the very existence Law itself exists because there's an

[3] This is also one of the main reason I had written this book in the first place.

external factor leading to its construction in the first place. So, in a sense, a traditional constitution which uphold itself as absolute, are inherently more dangerous that the constitution that we will discussed, because it can either leave the subject in a state of absolute relativism in which no law is any better than whims of a child. To avoids this problem then, that society that adheres to Legal Positivism, forced to enact the law by force, leading to an absolute authoritarianism, where a law, instead of referring and a servant of the people, were a tool for absurd oppression that has no justification in its very core.

- The Problem of Machine

One then might argue that *all of these problems is simply a matter of optimization.* The problem in which the algorithmic bureaucrat register is that *humans were simply flawed beings in which, unable to take account for a relentless amount of data and variables therein*. This, upon the fact than human is oftentimes biased and are limited by their biological and psychological urges, limits human from actually making the most rational decision. All problem then, is a result of input overload that can be mitigated by total digitalization of bureaucracy of democracy into algorithm of AI: a total digitalization. In this case, the computer would be coded in such a way it gains the real time 'wants' from the populace via its registers, and then harmonizes them automatically into a policy and management. Such proposal was even called to be 'the answer to Plato's paradox of democracy' by AI enthusiasts.

Now, from an Irritocrat point of view, the problem of the Datacracy occurs in assuming that all data are sum of every variable there is; when in reality, a signal is insofar, only a small fragments of the noises of reality itself. There is simply a variable that is unregisterable without collapse of superposition, that would became the new unconscious of such system. Take any computing machine and you'll find that a machine can't simply register '0'; it is always signified into binaries of sort, and were never a pure nothingness (eg. 0.00000..1). Or let's take the nature of registration; it necessarily alienate because the structure of registration of noise into signal would inherently differentiate the noise from signal, creating another binary of signal/non-signal. Therefore, via logic of registration itself, a data would necessarily incomplete. Such is the nature of data itself, and therefore total registration of reality into signal is structurally impossible.

Now, a systemic Contradiction within datacracy itself; there is a situation where a sample data within ai database were diluted, and thus creating what Baudrillard would call a Hyperreal, upon original reality/sample. We can see this for example, in the realm of Image generation. When a machine were told to produce 100 new image from iteration of 10 samples, at first it do its job fine. But once you mark up the order, say 1001, a computer would be forced to make up for the lack of sample from its own AI generated images. Such then, a product would simply resonate its own machine and thus, diverting from its purpose. Now, take this problem into the governance. If such policy that is produced creates 'the most rational policy', it doesn't hard to image a dystopian world like that in Brave New World, in which because of optimization, it sacrifice the 'real life' itself; because the input of the populace became its leading factor in deciding a policy; in which the policy would affects the populace; and they began resonate into diluted hyperreal.

Now, one way to mitigate this is to give a constant input of new original samples to the machine; but every signal is come with a cost of privacy: *at what point is a greater good are justified in trespassing a privacy of human being?* And if such limitation are held, who are taking the decision about it and who would control the access to the Algorithm? A machine simply cannot to be held responsible, therefore it cannot be issued to make a management decision.

Even if the problem of ethics were mitigated, and that populace are in total consent with this fact, a signal is still already a collapse form of the noises. It is no longer the question whether a person is consent being misrepresented or not anymore; the fact that the machine just alienate the noise to produce a signal from superpositional reality, is itself is the very problem that datacracy points out in Human governance: a human cannot make rational output better than a machine. Now, the question became: does data accounts for all reality there is, that makes a machine as flawed as human? The computer cannot register externalities; at least Human now can register the known unknowns, but a machine cannot even register its own bias. The problem then shifted from *who are the more effective in its managerial position* into *which one would be able to evolve and reflect from the noise or contradiction it once had excluded?* Since we seek a self-reproduction rather than *self-mutilation* – that is, to preserve coherency of the structure, it may mutilate some of its variables into oblivion, and thus repress more rather than accounts more – a total digitalization that some proposes might be insufficient in handling these matters.

- The Problem with Total Anarchy

Anarchy still requires structures. To assume the opposite is to be blind with hidden structural hierarchy that had been unconsciously pre-established within a community; moreover, there's a problem with mass organization of anarchy itself. What works for some might not for others; some geographical landscape that societies were built upon may require high level of organization out of necessity. Take for example, in the region where there's an inequality of resources and fertility of land itself. In this case, assuming anarchy can develop; one group of anarchy would simply dominate others unconsciously if they are based upon more prosperous land than others. In such cases then, to mitigate inequality is to necessitate a superstructure in which redistribution of resources can take place from prosperous land into improvised areas to equalize human development. Now, a federation simply based on 'trust' is significantly lacking to points out the contradiction; let's say in terms of negotiation: when a side is inherently disadvantaged from the starting point, it is absurd to label it as 'trust-based system' when there's an underlying hierarchy that necessitate one side to simply accepts the terms to gains more in their party, in oppose to simply starve because 'they don't accepts the condition of the federation'.

The problem here is structural – more precisely, the question it propose: *can an anarchy exists in the first place?* As per logic of system, a total anarchy is simply impossible from its first manifestation. A Group still assuming a structure, and with structure there's always one that dominates; no matter if they are still register each other's input. If then such structure are justified because it is based on 'consent', then one can argue that 'a general populace of totalitarian regime also have the consent that a ruler may oppress them; because all in all, it is for the better good of the nation'. The problem lies not within structure itself; but on how we structure them to be. This is why it is better to admit a structure and then model a form of governance in such a way that it registers what it had been excluded to remains coherent in the first place: a system are autopoietic; my goal is to make them evolve more quickly by making a

structure that is sensitive to its irritants. This is far more sustainable approach because designing a total anarchy is ‘forming the formless’, which is absurd.

3. A Proposal

- On Language

We had explained how there can’t be a perfect system, and now we move onto the discussion of evolution of language, and how would this can be a model for a legal system. Let’s get back to that very theorem. The implication is this: If any human product is can either be Incomplete or Inconsistent, then it must be the also the case that the very Language we use itself, are inherently incomplete, in a sense that, they cannot grasp the full nature of Reality and Experience itself. A Language, therefore, must dialectically and asymptotically evolve in regard to reality that it refers to, as new discoveries and experience are found by Human; else, if it were ‘complete’, it will be self-referential and just became a dogma that is unfit and misaligned with reality; just waiting for it to crash into a wall of reality that forces reconstruction all together. The example of such event is in the middle age, where the suppression of rational knowledge from medieval times inevitably revolutionize human rationality with such impact that dethrone the entire scholastic tradition from its main spectacle; The contradictions within Christian dogma were ultimately overruled by the very rationality it once claimed to uphold, therefore replacing the notion of ‘truth’ from religion into secular rationality.

Language must evolve in regard to reality, else it will be irrelevant. For example, suppose you thought that anything is a food, then at other point in time you realize that some of the thing you see is not a food. This change is a result of disruption of the Real or Irritant from the environment to your symbolic order: to put it simply, this disruption is the results from an error of your language to capture reality, and language follows accordingly.

You don’t ‘create’ the notion that a bottlecap, for example, are not to be eaten because the symbolic told you so, but because when you think it was a food, your body rejected it by making you choke on it when you eat it on assumption that ‘this bottlecap is a food’. This disruption forces a change in how you categorize 'food' and 'bottlecap,' prompting your symbolic order to adjust and reproduce itself. Language then, is necessarily incomplete, and that makes its derivatives (e.g. Law) also inherently lacking. Language is like the kind of program that got updated by a company whenever a user receives a bug from their smartphone; there is a problem, then it got solved, then another problem exists, and so on. This is Dialectics 101. But we won’t delve deep into the nature of Language, as it will be discussed in another paper.

- Homeostatis and the cause of change-resistent system (10/08/2025)

if we want to create a system in which the homeostat is evolution or development of the welfare of the commons with the identity of a nation that can be changed until its homeostat is effective contradiction handling that the state is eventually, essentially dissolved into anarchy via maturation of its lower system? i mean, all nation's goal is sovereignity and continuity, and i think that's makes it pretty self-defeating. too bad ostorm didn't interract enough with stafford's idea; of that the academy wasn't notices this. well, that's maybe what i'll do with my irritocracy. a form of govenrnance built not upon fixed authority or positive, finalized truth; but instead upon

the structured response to persistent contradiction, irritation, and unresolved lack within the system. it is a government that institutionalizes critique as its sovereign force..
maybe mandatory algedonic signal is a start to give the system necessary feedback that isnt its own voice. just a simple pain pleasure or rating mechanism for policy that affects lower system. and maybe something to contain contradiction enough to affects future planning also; a contradiction that can rot the operator if not handled well; maybe implement chair decay rate in proportion to responsiveness to contradiction and all; and legislators that oftentimes dormant can have their decay rate in proportion to what problems do each discover? we dont need a representatives of people who doesnt represent our problem, after all.

- A Proposal for Evolutionary Law

This leads to an important conclusion: Constitution must also be either incomplete or inconsistent. Incomplete, in this sense, means that the Constitution is consistent in its logic, yet it needs something Outside of the constitution itself (e.g. Reality, Human Justification, etc) to stay relevant. This means the constitution must evolve alongside reality to remain relevant. Otherwise, if it is self-referential, it becomes inconsistent and unreliable. Then, like language, a constitution must evolve dialectically, or risk becoming inconsistent and self-defeating.

But then the question occurs: if Truth cannot be grasped, then on what basis our law should be? If it arbitrary, then it will lead to relativism where Power and will is only basis, which is absurd; and if it absolute, derived from universal, then it will lead to authoritarianism. To answer this, we will propose a third way.

We must then look at the nature of language: they are evolving dialectically, in regard to reality it infers, and that evolution would never be complete, or in other word, asymptotic. In this case, the reality or truth does exist, but it can only be approach asymptotically through dialectics. Then by this nature of language, a constitution then, must acknowledge its own incompleteness. We will then call this constitution, a Godelian constitution.

An Amendment must then include these propositions:

“No law or institution shall be absolute or above critique—except this very principle itself.”
“No law, leader, or moral claim may appeal to its own authority. All must reference external realities.”
“If these principles are ever revoked, the constitution itself becomes invalid and must revert to its prior state of structured incompleteness.”

Consider a scholastic approach to perfection: If God is perfect and fundamentally different from creation, then He can only be known through Negative Theology—defining Him by what He is not, rather than what He is. Now, apply this into the construction of a system, instead of trying to build a perfect system, why don’t we take a negative approach to expose the system weaknesses indefinitely, and then forces the system to tackle each contradiction that occurs within the government as they are operating? In this case, every contradiction that occurs, are not merely

problem to be covered, but problem to be tackled so that we can get a better system each day. In this case, our system then will asymptotically evolve into perfection, instead of being stagnant while assuming finality when the problem still occurs, leading to absolutism. Law must reference justice by eliminating contradictions, not by enforcing an assumed ideal. A Law then, must be contingent upon reality and not upon itself.

The point is this: a system must explicitly state its hyper-contingency to other reality/variables that it seeks to subjectivize; a state must be doubtful whether their rule is still valid or not, and how would they can be better in the future. We don't need a perfect system; we need a system that is learning from its mistake and evolve accordingly to higher synthesis. Some revolutionists might see this as too slow for making any change, but I would argue that change doesn't need to be painful; positive change is still a change whether it is achieved through violence or soft reform. What's matter is not a violence in itself, but how are we going to build a structure together.

Maybe then some anarchy purists might ask: *why we must participate in governance and structure, while our goal is against its existence in the first place?* The answer lies in the fact that *even anarchy itself is a structure.* If anarchy is perhaps, the most ideal governance there is, then inevitably the trajectory of this system would results in society that is anarchic. The truth of such argument must be proven to be achieved; likewise, anarchy cannot be given and must be worked upon. This is better, than let's say, unrealistically waits for a *great revolution* of the masses, when the masses itself is already conditioned by ideology; most of all, *they know that they are being lied or being conditioned by ideology, yet still were operate within it*. The best cure therefore, is not a total dissolution of state because it inevitably creates another forceful alienation and thus grant another tyrant a chance to rise again; but in the hacking of the structure itself to cohere themselves into self-dissolution. In other word, we must make it so that the state goes so efficiently, the subject internalize its logic, and thus the role of the state become redundant enough for its own dissolution; an anarchy through state via maturity of its subject.

To put it simply: *Incompleteness is not a failure. It is a signal of life.*
Alienation is not despair. It is the gap through which freedom enters.
Law, too, must learn to breathe.

So, a state that evolve via its amendable law according to the contradiction that they purposefully hunts. A governance dictated by its irritant fr its evolution process: an Irritocracy. With this, we will began explaining how would such a system work theoretically.

Section 1: Foundational Principles

This section defines the core principles of the Gödelian Constitution, ensuring governance remains dynamic, self-correcting, and aligned with justice and dialectical refinement.

Chapter 1: The Law of Structured Incompleteness

- **Establishes that no law, ideology, or authority shall be considered final.**
  We had discussed on why a law should never be absolute. Else, it will bring us into whether a moral relativism, or authoritarianism and unchecked power.

The observed solution therefore, is to consider the law itself as an incomplete product that can be refined via asymptotic dialectics. This can be achieved through the construction of the principle of incompleteness itself into the constitution.

The constitution must contain mechanisms that recognize that laws and systems of government are always open to revision. No law can be considered absolute and unchangeable, except for the basic principles that guarantee the dialectic itself. This system avoids stagnation by preventing legal dogmatism and ensuring political flexibility. This is the Function of the amendment of incompleteness principle inside the Constitution, that is, to ensure that the constitution would not become absolute or falls into relativism.

- Ensures laws evolve through dialectical contradiction analysis.

  A question might be asked: how would a process of an evolution of Constitution itself happened? Since the constitution itself already acknowledge its own incompleteness, then it must be the case that they also acknowledge the contradiction that occurs within said government. The process, therefore, is for a nation to seek which contradiction that occurs within its own rule, and then proceed to tackle them one by one.

  Let's imagine for a moment, how science developed. They never assume a final answer, and when there is a contradiction between what they had discovered and what is their current model are, they began to build and refine their existing model to better fit and aligned with reality; else, the science would be irrelevant, and the inaccuracies of such knowledge would be fatal if it were to be ignored.

  Let's take another example from history itself. The progression of history of politics was never to be taken as final: Theocracy were replaced with Feudalism, Feudalism was replaced with Monarch, then Monarch were replaced with Capitalism. Each era, are resolving the previous contradiction and then producing another new contradiction. The history never assumed a final round, but a dialectical and asymptotic progression of human politics and system. That is also the case for Philosophy, economy, and even religion itself, as they were facing a new contradiction each day and resolving them. We infer that this progression would never become stagnant, as the Truth itself would always be beyond our reach, and that our progression will always be asymptotic, because of the very nature of Language's incompleteness itself.

  From these examples, we then can theoretically build a system where, instead of hiding contradiction, they would expose them and then refine them accordingly as the time progress forward. This would ensure a perpetual refinement and better Justice each day, without prolonged oppression and contradiction within a nation.

- Introduces the principle that legal structures must contain built-in mechanisms for critique and refinement.

  To build a constitution which uphold the dialectics of Law itself, a constitution, therefore, must contain at least these principles to exists:

  1. Structured Incompleteness

     The constitution must contain mechanisms that recognize that laws and systems of government are always open to revision.

No law can be considered absolute and unchangeable, except for the basic principles that guarantee the dialectic itself. This then would include the product of said law itself, including those who are key governance (e.g. President, Senators, etc), Act, Institution (e.g. Economic, Education, etc), and all other that is related to said law. Consequently, it will shape how lawmaker construct and decide a law itself, and how the executor of said law will act in the basis that what are they doing can be criticized and not absolute finality.

This principle also demands for every human construct there is, to be necessarily contingent upon rational justification. Here, self-referential power are to be abolished and instead replaced with contingent power in which it can be taken account accordingly. The body of government, institution, law, cannot be made in-itself, in a way that it justifies itself, but must take a justification from other related things. The existence of an institution or law cannot be justified by merely self-referential logic, but must be able to provide a valid reasoning for its existence in the first place, in which it can be judged upon people. The case with self-referential power or law is that, they are oftentimes borrow or steal a justification from things that is covered. What do I mean by that is, there are no void justification: something must came from something else, less it is absurd to assume that something came out of nothing. Let's say, the justification of anti-immigration law; they are not void to begin with, as they carry the hidden justification of 'saving the economy', but instead of addressing the related matter, it divert the true justification with action that is completely unrelated and oftentimes counter-productive and are contradictory from the underlying justification. In here, one must be able to distinguish between contingent justification and self-referential justification.

2. Dialectical and Evolutionary Law

   A constitution must also include the system in which, the law is properly evolving through dialectics and its external reference. It cannot be the case that a constitution which supposedly be the foundation of changing society are to be static and self-referential. Any form of change within the system must be in accordance with its external reference. Like a language that evolve through the dialectics via discoveries of reality, a constitution therefore must also evolve according to what it is addressed, and what it is affected upon.

   The evolution direction of course, being that a law must evolve to reduce its contradiction within the subject of the law.

3. Distribution of Power Based on Consciousness

   Then we move on the principle of hierarchy. Leadership in this system is not based on popularity or oligarchy, but based on the level of awareness. The smarter will get more influence than the lesser. This is a hard pill to swallow for some people, but this is for a good reason. Direct democracy is often co-opted by oligarchs and those who seek to exploit the system. Oftentimes, a democracy without a hierarchy would simply transforms into a mob rule, a mobocracy. This is further strengthened by the foundation of the system itself (i.e. Structured Incompleteness), because else, if

anyone can critique a government not based on real intellectual justification but rather an arbitrary whim, then the system would necessarily collapse into another mobocracy that is coopted by the ruling class.

We try to preserve that democracy still exists, but on the caveat that there'll be an intellectual hierarchy where those with deeper understanding are given greater responsibility.

Political Schools and Democracy Awareness Tests (DAT) are the main instruments in ensuring competent leadership. The aspect of Education in the realm of political awareness then, must be an universal right where everyone are not obliged to, but are rightfully allowed to participate, for them to have a higher influence of votes within a country. This would also hinder that populist rhetoric of the charismatic yet corrupt leader, so that he will instead have to 'fight in the same ring' with those who has the same or equal capacities of intellect, rather than rallying an unguided mass against potentially good candidate or act.

4. Transparency and Public Participation Based on Dialectics

   All policies must have a philosophical justification, not just legalistic or pragmatic. The constitution must provide a mechanism that allows the public to challenge policies without having to go through a destructive revolution. People's forums and dialectic councils should be established to continuously assess the direction of state policy. This principle then, must also be applied to critique itself to the government, so that there won't be an unreasonable voices disturbing democracies and system in work; but it is maybe more pragmatic if every critique, also has a proposed solution for said problem. It is better then, to have any negation be delivered with negation of the negation itself; but we know that it won't be the case for every critique to have an immediate solution, so the point here is, a conversation of said problem must be addressed and opened publicly. The Role of the government, is to work upon said contradiction and accumulate the critique to be further addressed into higher synthesis.

5. Anti-Stagnation and Anti-Authoritarianism Mechanisms

   This system avoids stagnation by preventing legal dogmatism and ensuring political flexibility. For example, if there's any institution or governmental leader, act in a way that is contradictory to the principle of incompleteness, for example silencing/ignoring critiques, or acting on the basis of arbitrary will rather than external reference, it will then be invalidated by said principle. Then, it would be unstable for them, because they are in a prone position, where the external critiques will undermine their act on the basis of logical/empirical contradiction.

   Let's say, the highest order there is, a Supreme Court that is responsible for guarding the constitution itself. If they are found to transgress the law by, lets say, removing the principle of the Incompleteness itself (No law shall be absolute…), then by systemic principle, it will be hold back by its second clause (If this law is removed…the constitution must return to principle of Structural Incompleteness).

Then, there'll be an activation of People's Tribunal, let's say, to uphold the constitution itself and therefore, removing a corrupt leader/lawmaker, and replacing it with a better one while preserving said constitution.

If a regime begins to stagnate or become authoritarian, the constitution should have automatic protocols that allow for systemic intervention. No leader should be allowed to come to power without regular evaluation. If they fail to maintain dialectic or shut down criticism, they should be able to be replaced through legitimate mechanisms. The constitution should explicitly prohibit the freezing of dialectic, whether in the form of censorship, repression, or dogmatization of state ideology.

This would be discussed more perhaps in another section.

6. Humanitarian Principle

   But said changes and evolution cannot lost its direction. A nation therefore, cannot justify in the name of self-correction, diminish or erases the inherent human right in its form. The law cannot, in the name of logic, transgress the very nature of the people it serves which makes the law happened in the first place. What's matter here, is the direction of said evolution and not the acceleration itself, because rapid changed without careful consideration can lost its controlled direction, therefore harming more than doing societal good. So, humanitarian principle, the principle of common good, the Universal, must remain to be the goal of every evolution there is, to reach a higher coherency between our ideal, and our reality.

Chapter 2: Dialectical and Evolutionary Law

- Mandates periodic reassessment of all laws and policies.

  Because of the principle of structured incompleteness, in every public policy or its products, there must be a clause that allows for review based on emerging contradictions. There must be objective indicators that show when a policy fails and must be changed. If a policy creates stagnation or serious contradictions, there must be an automatic revision mechanism.

  But said contradiction and criticism, if carried recklessly without a safeguard, would results in a relativism that leads nowhere but chaos. So, in order to make the society remains stable while keeping its evolutionary process, one must implement the Hierarchy of contradiction itself. The bigger the contradiction, that is, the bigger the problem, the urgent it must be addressed first at foremost, before delving into smaller contradiction. Contradictions must be ranked by severity, and the state must act within a specific timeframe to resolve them. We can infer how big a contradiction is, by looking at the amount of affected overlapping aspect, how dangerous it is for the safety and rights of the people, and all things that is related.

  There's also a mandatory periodic reassessment of all laws and policies. Like for example, for every 1-3 years the law had been procured, it then must be reassessed in its efficiency, effectiveness to address a problem, what contradiction did we face, and how can we make the policy better. In this way, the role of the government is to have themselves accepts this constructive criticism, and then work to manage all of it to reach

a better coherency of an act. This must be applied across all 3 major structures: the Judiciary, Legislative, and Executive.

With this system, we can infer which governmental leader that chooses to accepts criticism and follows the principle of structured incompleteness therefore making a progress and movement, and which leader that stagnate and receive the same problem for a term period even when an obvious contradiction and alternative occurs and proposed. The consequences of such system are that the leader or any key figures in a government will face a decay of legitimacy if they ignore the problem for every time the contradiction occurs and affects the society through the lens of justified criticism, in which they can be held responsible behind the court if the contradiction still persists, and can face replacement if the contradiction became too big. That is also the case for every governmental institution, including perhaps the supreme court itself, via People's tribunal if said entity transgress the very law they supposed to hold high.

- Requires contradictions in the legal system to trigger automatic revision.

  For every revision on legal system, there must be an empirical and rational proof of contradiction and consequences of why the current law are insufficient and that there's a better alternative. A system cannot, for example, in the name of self-refinement, changes a law. That is because if such justification is used without contingency of real needs, a justification that supposed to represent a real problem became a justification that insists upon itself, therefore becoming another ontological theft; where problems are addressed, but misdirected to serve an unclear motive. Every justification of a refinement therefore, must be contingent upon something else (i.e. Real Contradiction) to justify its existence or act, else it will be a chaos.

  Some contradiction may require an immediate action and refinement; else it can harm the overall stability of a system. In this case, the threat and contradiction is visible or real enough for its problem to manifest into societies through the lens of ordinary folks; one can sense that before and after the implementation of an act is having a quite contrast that it is uncomfortable enough for them to get disrupted in their daily lives. In such cases, a revision or refinement of an act must be acted upon immediately, else it will further destabilize the overall society. This particular contradiction, with the urgency of resolution then, must be reported and backed up by an empirical proof of harm, logical consequences if an act carried upon for longer time, and possible resolution of said problem. We imagine then, every report on the government can be accumulated into one institution that handles such and such contradiction, and manage them appropriately according to their hierarchy of urgency and needs.

- Neutrality of Contradiction

  But what to ensure that the measurement of contradiction remains objective? One cannot just rely on intuitive knowledge and then assume that one contradiction is better than the other. Then, the qualification of contradictions must remain objective. To ensure this, We will determine on three-pathways to determine a contradiction.

  1. Public Petition

     One way to support a contradiction would be petitioning. Maybe there's 100,000 signatures or so, to determine that There is a contradiction that is felt.

2. Empirical Harm

   Another way is to look at the metrics. GDP drop or inequality metrics can determine a contradiction.

3. Academic Consensus

   One can also determine a contradiction via peer-reviewed audits. A report, possibly from an institution (C3O, Explained further in another section), can be taken into assessment in academia. 70% agreement in peer-reviewed audits can determine if a contradiction is valid.

Some contradiction may be subjective. Some stability may feels like stagnation but are necessary stability. To decide this, assessment may be required.

Chapter 3: The Principle of Universal Reference

- Introduces the Universal Reference Point (URP) as a guiding principle for justice and governance.

  From aggregate amount of a concept, let's say justice, the distinction then can be made hierarchically through the examination of less contradiction and sustainability of a concept of Justice. The reference therefore, is decided by examination of contradiction behind any concept, and the sustainability of said concept. One can argue that this is as if we can judge whether slavery is Moral or not. Historically speaking, they are once considered moral, but as we progressed towards a higher ethical progression, we then can decide that slavery is indeed immoral if we take a general standard, or Overton windows of current time.

  This is also applied, not only justice, but other concept: General Good, Function, Universal, Love, or all of what we try to manifest within our reality but cannot be encapsulated fully, whether materially or abstractly speaking. A technology, for example let's say a computer, the dialectics occurs between its supposed function and the limitation and our current understanding of it. A concept of love is between the ideal and what are the current contradiction in between the gaps. This is how we synthesize between Realism and Idealism, that Idealism are our guiding force and what our contradiction are supposed to be sublimed towards, and reality is the subject of said sublimation.

- Ensures society moves toward greater alignment with truth and sustainability.

  The point is this: society must strive towards a better coherency and alignment with the URP every time there is a contradiction. Government and its subject, every living person there is, is not supposed to see themselves or the others, or any mortal system there is, as an absolute. Where truth can only be approach, one cannot be stagnant and think that they had passed the finish line, for every perception and language there is, contain a gap of reality and human understanding. Changes must remain progressive, as our understanding of the concept of just develops.

  But said change cannot be a havoc revolution in which a change or transition between one system into another cannot be a radical change when the people are not yet ready. The change should be incremental. What matters here is not an acceleration of a betterment of society, but rather the direction of the change itself. If a rapid change is

causing havoc and instability, then it is better to act incrementally while striving towards good one step at the time. Another reason is that, if such rapid change cause instability, the people may be affected in a way that is unpredictable, and thus, causing the people to have a disdain for such progress and thus, making them reject the better idea of justice, no matter how good it is.

- Distinguishes between human approximations of justice and the asymptotic nature of ultimate justice.

  We then look at the nature of language. It evolves dialectically as it is encountering the noumena. Its encounter is always asymptotic, as the nature of language itself will always be incomplete. There's a clear distinction between the universal-in-itself, and conceptualized universal. The Universal-in-itself, remains static and perfect, as in, they are outside the realm of logic and act as a reference point of a language. The conceptualized universal, our understanding of reality, however, evolves as we've progressed epistemically through the time. The gaps between the Noumena and Phenomena, will produce a gap between our knowledge and reality beyond it. This gap will produce a contradiction in which we must resolve in order to have a higher coherence of reality. This gap, the nature of language that is always pointing beyond itself to its true reference, will be called an object Phi. An Object phi, is a true function/meaning that language always encapsulate dialectically and asymptotically. So, while the reality itself remains unchanged, our knowledge of it will always evolve. There is an ideal inside the form, in which we try to refine our understanding to fix this gap, although asymptotically.

  A mistake happens like previous example, when one confuses an interpretation of reality as valid as reality itself. This urge of absoluteness of a man is what had oppressed people in history, and stole the true meaning of things, hijacking them and twist them to fit their narratives to justify their rule or conduct. This is what happens when, a knowledge or any information, rather than becoming a representation of something beyond itself, it was twisted into something that insist upon itself, making it misaligned with reality, and thus became a parasitic on its own. An information then, rather than representing a reality, became a self-justifying existence in which it no longer serves the reality, but sustaining a system, regime, or even self-ego. Like we had insisted before, one then must see their knowledge as open ended and not absolute; notice the difference between the Ideal and our understanding of an Ideal itself, between Faith and our understanding of Faith, between Universal and our understanding of it, and etc. Universal, Good, God, Revelation, Reality, they are all absolute in which our knowledge should evolve towards dialectically rather than dictate what should it be.

Chapter 4: Preventing Stagnation and Authoritarianism

- Outlines mechanisms to prevent the centralization of power.

  Centralization of power oftentimes became a problem in a democracy, where people that supposed to be its own rulers, instead choosing to follows a charismatic leader based on emotional decision rather than a rational one. This can also be the case with the elite's manipulation in which they can hoard an influence for themselves, either through wealth, power, or charisma they possess.

But the idea behind preventing the centralization of influence itself, are not merely based upon an idea that anything central is bad. What's bad is that, the centralization became a self-justifying concept without an external reference, and thus became an arbitrary thing that can distort the true democracies. That is also the case for Decentralization; not exactly as anything non-hierarchical is good, where a concept of good itself are inherent within the subject and thus making them self-referential. To make a better system then, an influence must be dynamic, in a sense that, a subject of a nation should therefore be a subject into another, incomplete system (that can be criticized) that decides the influence of oneself via their awareness and dialectical capabilities upon related matters. A System must be contingent and cannot be an absolute in itself, else there'll be a perversion of democracy.

To prevent this, we had provided the foundation of the system itself with Structured Incompleteness, thus any subject or law that is contrary to that principle became invalid. But to further support this, a more detailed system might be required.

Let's we move on the flaw of perverse democracy. Here, the common argument is that a people can act rationally and make a good decision based upon themselves. Through the lens of Godelian Logic, one then can make a distinction between what is truly became a justification, and what is covered behind that justification. Here, the 'People', insist upon themselves that they are 'Good' and thus were 'Able to Make Decision for themselves'. We can see how 'Good' had became a true justification of this argument, but it twisted into self-justification by the subject of 'The People', which insists upon itself, and thus conclude an argument with self-referential clause that 'They were able to make decision for themselves'. One then can ask, Upon what justification that one can claim that That is the case? A real justification here is that, they are 'Good'. Here, 'Goodness', became a true self-justification that supposed to be a reference of the 'People' itself, not the other way around. In here, we then must provide a system in which, the People are reference against the Good itself, and thus making the people not as an absolute to be considered, but a variable in which its influence are determined by their alignment with the 'Good' itself.

So how can we make a such system work? Beside to institutionalize the structured incompleteness itself unto the constitution, what else remains to be done? How can we make a system where, instead of the People determining what is Good, it is Good that dictates the People in which they can align themselves with? We would then propose that such system require a Hierarchical Democracy, in which anyone carries an influence, but that influence itself are not weighted the same. An influence, must be determined by a subject's overall awareness of the politics and their environment they were in. But such system would become another elitist if it was only divided by self-justifying system, so in this case, the hierarchies of vote must become dynamic, in which they are constantly reassessed by Dialectical tests, free education that must be an universal right, and all of that in which, the core principle is that the people became a subject of 'Good' itself before gaining an influence, not became a 'Good' in itself. In this system, the influence then must become a dynamic structure in which all subject participates inside, in which one way to have a better influence is for them to pass required assessment through an education that is provided by the state.

With this system of dynamic ground of awareness, a charismatic and intelligent, yet manipulative person, cannot hoard an influence, because they must fight against the

people with the same or higher influence, instead of rallying a low-weighted influences with their charisma; its not by preventing centralization or decentralization of power itself, but to have themselves a subject of another incomplete system in which it can be criticized by all of the constituents of said country through rational proof and lens.

- Introduces automatic safeguards against ideological dogmatization.

  Because of the principle of structured incompleteness, any attempt to suspend or suppress a critique will trigger automatic constitutional dissolution; any Law cannot be absolute, less it will fall into decays of legitimacy. The decay of legitimacies will reach its negation through Supreme Court, or its external highest authority would be a public, People's Tribunal, in which the people will carry dialectical process to reestablish governance based on principle of structured incompleteness, based on the second clause of constitutional reboots. In this system, leadership and institutions must remain open to challenge, ensuring that no ideology ossifies into dogma.

  In time of crisis, a transitional governance or emergency powers cannot grant permanent authority to any individual or group; and all emergency decisions then must be reviewed post-crisis, to upheld the normalcy of structured incompleteness.

- Establishes criteria for dissolving regimes that fail to remain dialectically open.

  Then how do we determine how the law properly evolve? We claim that the laws and policies must always have a periodic evaluation mechanism. We imagine that it will do so in the sublation of contradiction. The logic here is this: If a society faces the same kind of contradiction in the time period of governmental leadership, let's say 3-5 years of evaluation, then by logic, the leadership doesn't properly follow the constitution and therefore must be held accountable before the law. On the contrary, if a society faces a new kind of contradiction while resolving the old one, then the system is working properly, thus gaining a higher form of societal progress.

  Leadership, act, institution, all of governmental aspect of societies therefore, demanded to resolve a current contradiction to face a new contradiction; resolving previous problem and contradiction for them to stay relevant; else, it will face a decay of legitimacy. More so if leadership actively tries to suppress a critique or even silencing them, this would be a biggest red flag in which can be used by the people to demand a government for a change of leadership itself, as the constitution demand it.

  Then the question also follows: if we can see a progress or stagnation through the transformation of contradiction itself, how do we actually determine between a real contradiction and the fake one? We took this question seriously, and ponders upon the historical experience of the Nazi Regime. There, when Hitler came into power, there is already a contradiction, an inequality, flawed bureaucrats, and all of that follows. Then, rather than pointing at the real issue, the Fascist instead blames it unto the imaginary problem: the Jews and the Communists. We then know how to discern such ontological theft by looking at its object phi, the real meaning behind, and what it is directed instead. So, instead of proper economics reform, the act that is proposed is to use 'justified' violence against this imaginary problem by promising to sold economics and societal problems. Then, managing to 'steal' justification from the people, they rise to power through ontological theft of the narratives.

  So, if we were to take a look through the lens of Asymptoticism, there can't be a 'real' contradiction that is faked. This is obvious, as for every proposal of movement or reform

there is, there must be underlying motives behind it and why it is occurs in the first place. So, one can tries to see what is the motivation that is being said by a movement, their justification (e.g. Economic Reform, the emancipation of the Oppressed, etc), and what are they proposing instead. By the proposal that is proposed, we then can see the direction what if, this proposal is actually acted upon? Then, one can discern the true motives behind a movement, what are they benefitting from, and how contrast that is with their used justification. A Fake contradiction, is not fake in a sense that, they occur in the empty space as to ‘spook the people with ghost’, but rather, they occur by stealing a justification from a real contradiction, and then repackages it with their narratives to divert a movement from actually progressing, into something which fits their motives and want. "Here, the 'ghost' carries a real justification that has been diverted. This represents the underlying Object Phi of a movement, which is then repackaged as Object Petit a—an illusion disguising the true issue.

This principle of structured incompleteness, also implies that, If a policy creates a major contradiction in society, the constitution must provide a fast and responsive revision path. This legal system is not just a fixed rule, but a system that evolves along with public awareness. The biggest contradiction are the most urgent problem that must be tackled within a society, before they can tackle another, lesser contradiction. This must be the case since the biggest contradiction are always overlaps and are determinantal of several aspect of human lives itself, economy, politics, stability, and all others.

But somehow, there is a contradiction that seems less, yet are determinantal of the bigger contradiction, like for example, Education and political awareness of the public. Then how do we determine such and such contradiction before others?

We then imagine the other than an option of tackling the biggest problem first, we may need to tackle not one, but several contradictions incrementally, since a lesser contradiction, although less, but precisely because of the lesser difficulties of said resolving these contradictions, a society may be able to take a second option that is, that is, to tackle several lesser contradictions other than biggest and the most difficult contradiction that takes ages to resolve.

This is then justifies the importance of a rhizomatic progress of a society, whether via government or NGO’s to addresses such contradiction properly side by side, bigger and lesser.

- Layered Exposure of Contradiction

  There’s a need for stable evolution within governance. A society cannot fall into chaos for the sake of refinement, nor it is to be stagnated. There’s a fine line between movement and stagnation in which we must stive toward. It would then be appropriate to propose a multi-layered approach in which contradiction is resolved, aside from the size of contradiction itself.

  Not every law should be reviewed at the same rate. Core governance principles (structured incompleteness, dialectical openness) should be reviewed periodically (e.g., every 10 years). Social policies and economic laws should have shorter review cycles (2-5 years) to allow adjustments without destabilization. Emergency contradictions (ones that cause immediate harm) should have rapid response mechanisms to trigger urgent revisions. In this case, stability would remain unharmed, while the overall evolution of

society still progressing towards something better. What's matter here is not the speed of evolution itself, but rather its direction.

There's also the need for other method of resolution. Instead of arbitrary election cycles, governance is reviewed based on contradiction accumulation. If a leader fails to resolve contradictions after a certain threshold, they are automatically removed (rather than waiting for fixed elections) and changed. If contradictions persist beyond a defined limit, an emergency tribunal is formed to handle systemic failure. In this case, contradiction would be examined through rigorous assessment by an institution in which it will be explained in another section.

Section 2: Hierarchical Democracy and Governance

This section describes the structure of governance, balancing inclusivity with competency-based leadership.

Chapter 5: Distribution of Power Based on Awareness

How then a subject gains influence under this political constellation? When structured incompleteness becomes a law, becoming an absolutist is a lose-game in which threaten them to fall under decay of legitimacy. When critique is silenced, it will contradict the very system itself, and harm those who strive against the system. Then how would one able to gains political influence under this society? We grasp the concept of Hierarchical Democracy before, and thus we will delve deeper into how will it plays out. Particularly on this chapter, we will explain how power should based on merit and awareness rather than self-justified voting influence.

When self-refinement becomes a demand of society, those who were able to solve the real contradiction would become the most respected figure in a country. Those who has higher awareness of contradiction within society, holistically speaking, would gains a higher influence than those who were having less. Some would call it a caste, but the difference with the traditional hierarchical system is that, this hierarchy is dynamic; it cannot be the case that the position they were in, is also self-justified that it allows them to hoard influence indefinitely. An influence of a person is contingent upon something else, in this case, a Dialectical Awareness Test (DAT) can be a filter in which, all people are rightfully allowed to participate in, or not. This Test is also something that cannot be self-justified; there must be a decentralized, rotating panel in which they give light unto contradiction within the test itself so that all people can refine it.

After a subject had passed the DAT, they then receive a status in which, determine what class are they belong in terms of political influence, in form of vote. But the influence are not indefinite; for people who doesn't pass the test are still subject to influence politics although in lower influence; for the people who had the higher influence are periodically tested accordingly. I imagine that there'll be a three-tiered system, in which, if there's a 100 percent of population, 50 percent of a vote would be divided among the low tiered class; 25 percent of them would be divided among the middle class; and the remaining 25 percent would belong to the highest tier. That is because factually speaking, although

there’s a lot of those who want their voices be heard by their government, most of them were not particularly have an aptitude for politics, while those who has, are among the lesser percent of total population, more so in those who are considered ‘genius’, having more less population than the middle class. It is wiser for the writer to put all these class as having their influence proportional to their respected population. This would also to prevent a rise of a mobocracy in which, a charismatic leader that having more awareness would have to face those who has the same awareness/ability, rather than to rally a people against a potentially good leader. Let the people watched as who are amongst the higher tier that are having a less flaw than the others, that they can follow them.

But there’s a caveat; for the last two tier, the middle and the highest, there’ll be a periodic assessment that is as difficult as one reaches a higher political influence. For the middle class, for example, there’ll be a reassessment of DAT’s for every 3-5 years, or a year before an election seasons; for the highest one, more rigid assessment, or even have to produce an intellectual work to prove their right as having higher influence than others. There’s also the case for criminal records. I imagine that the middle class will be given a 3 chances of crimes (or one awful crime) before they are permanently belongs to the first tier; or that for the highest tier, one crime that is harmful is enough for them to have their right be taken away and demoted in to middle or even low tiered-class; that is, until those who are demoted can prove their right again after several reassessment and further refinement.

Those who are eligible to be placed into key position of Governance (Executive, Judiciary member) must pass the highest tier of this hierarchy before they were able to be a candidate for their placement into those positions.

Once hierarchy are structured, a way to make this dynamic is to have power be contingent. In this case, an universal right for education and political assessment must become free for every citizen. In this case, those who were not having an aptitude or into politics are able not to participate but still regains their influence although placed in the lower tier; and those who are pass were having an opportunity of having a better influence. The assessment varies; there can be a form of writing, debates, interview, or all others. The writer wants to adds a system where genuine critique of the system are valued and were able to raise someone’s influence. In this case, a critique of a system would be an incentive for the people if they ever wanting a good influence on political constellation. A compulsory education still remains, but only at the level of basic; as the vocational education will be funded by the government, and were a right for the people participate according to their abilities.

The point is this: we want to make a system where learning are encouraged; ethics are considered as a virtue; vice would have a repercussion in the form of decay of legitimacy; and power, knowledge, and position are dynamics and cannot be permanent. A position, cannot be self-justifying, and must be contingent upon something else for us to have a clear responsibility, and potential of further refinement.

Chapter 6: The Role of the Dialectical Council

When a structured incompleteness became its highest law, who will has the right to oversee them? In this constitution, a Supreme Court, which is the name for the highest authority in interpreting and changing the constitution, will be called a Dialectical Council. Upon in which general function of a Supreme Court currently exists, there’s also

another function in which, they oversee and maintain that any law that is passed is structurally incomplete and contingent; maintaining the environment of critique and refinement; resolving contradictory act or laws from constitutional law to regular law; and to preserve the absolute principle of structure incompleteness itself.

The member of Dialectical Council, aside from common requirement from a Supreme Court candidacy, would be those who had passed the highest DATs and are member of the highest tier. This council consists of individuals who have demonstrated the highest level of political awareness and ethics, selected through a selection process based on competence and awareness, not just popularity. There cannot be an indefinite term, and thus would have to limit they membership into fixed term; there must be a dynamic and rotating member of elites so that it will ensure that there's no form of self-referential elitism in a country.

Chapter 7: Public Participation and Political Education

When self-refinement became mandatory, it is also the case for the government or society to make the education itself universal. It cannot be the case that an education should be a privilege for those who are fortunate enough, therefore making the less fortunate unaccountable. An education should be a free right in which, all of people should able to access freely. A basic kind of education, must be mandatory in order to at least making the people grasp the concept of incompleteness itself, and to give them necessary information in which they can think for themselves. A need for Hierarchical Democracy require that the pursuit of Knowledge must become an universal right for everyone to participate in. It cannot be a commodity to be hoarded by elites, nor a privilege granted by authority—it must be an universal right, fundamental to human liberation and the pursuit of justice. Without access to knowledge and the ability to refine it, societies fall into ideological stagnation, authoritarianism, and systemic oppression.

Since Truth is asymptotic, no individual or institution can claim absolute knowledge, but all must have the right to approach it indefinitely. No interpretation of ideology, religion, science, or law can declare itself final—all must remain open to revision. A Gödelian Constitutional Framework ensures that knowledge remains structurally incomplete, preventing dogmatism and epistemic tyranny. Educational institutions, religious authorities, and political leaders must be subjected to continuous dialectical evaluation. Not for the sake of destroying faith or idealism itself, but for the sake of refining them. A truth must be sought and refined for it to better serve humanity.

A just society does not impose knowledge from above but ensures that all people have access to refine, challenge, and expand it. The right to knowledge is not just about access—it is about the ability to question, critique, and refine truth.

To establish knowledge as a universal right, a society must guarantee free and universal education, ensuring that no one is barred from learning due to economic, social, or political conditions; Institutionalize Public Criticism Forums, allowing every citizen to challenge government policies, scientific claims, and ideological narratives; Ensure transparency and prevent knowledge monopolies, so that information is never controlled by corporations, religious oligarchies, or authoritarian regimes.

An education cannot be a final or static model; it must become a kind of education that encourage its learner to seek continuous learning, both inside the institution itself, or outside of it. The final product of an education cannot be limited by the holistic quality of

all discipline of knowledge in which all people must adhere to the same final standard; but must produce an individual that can think and learn for themselves, encouraging an eternal learning for the whole society itself.

There is particular mandatory learning in which all people should participate in order to be able to vote. This is a basic education that covers all necessary subject of political or societal awareness to its student. There's also an advanced learning that is also free and accessible for those who seeks a higher influence in political constellation. Those who are pass would have the right to vote according to their rank and education.

The institution of education itself must remains contingent and were able to be refined and critiqued. There has to be a rotational panel in which they carry the task of seeking contradiction within current education and propose a solution to it.

A truly free and just society does not merely allow knowledge—it demands its constant expansion and refinement. Without the right to knowledge, humanity is condemned to oppression, illusion, and stagnation. But with structured-incompleteness embedded into its foundation, society ensures that knowledge remains an ever-expanding force of liberation. Truth is not to be owned, but sought. Knowledge is not to be dictated, but refined. Let no institution claim finality, for the pursuit of knowledge is infinite.

Chapter 8: Meritocratic Political Influence and Awareness Tests

- Introduces Dialectical Awareness Tests (DATs) as a measure of political competence.

While all individuals have the right to knowledge, those with higher awareness and dialectical ability should help refine governance. DATs ensure that decision-making is guided by competency rather than mass manipulation. True knowledge-based governance does not create an elite class—it empowers all individuals to develop their awareness by making all the institution of knowledge itself contingent upon something else. No institution shall be self-referential, and it must be a network of dialectical refinement that supports each other contingently.

That being said, what should be the division of such hierarchical competency inside this democracy? We will divide this tier into 3 class, in which they are divided dynamically by their competency. All of these tests, would have to be an universal right instead of commodity, and its institution would be a contingent system in which, it can be refined through critique and institutionalized public debates.

1. Basic Dialectical Competency Test (BDCT) – Entry Level

This test measures understanding of governance, contradictions, and dialectical reasoning. Passing it would allow standard voting rights in public policy decisions. Failure does not remove political rights, but limits policy-making influence. They still got their right to vote, but their overall influence would be limited in a sense that, other than Presidential, Legislative, and Regional election, they won't be able to participate in public debates about policies. The aggregate amount of vote from this tier is 50% of whole votes, divided evenly among basic voters.

2. Advanced Awareness Evaluation (AAE) – Mid-Level

This test would assess one's ability to detect contradictions, analyze justice, and predict systemic consequences. It would grant greater voting weight and access to policy proposal mechanisms, including public debates and systemic critique. They would also

be eligible for working into C3O (section 4), and were able to choose their leadership democratically. The aggregate amount of vote from this tier is 25% of whole votes, divided evenly among Middle voters.

3. Mastery of Dialectical Synthesis (MDS) – High-Level

This test would require oneself to demonstrate independent dialectical reasoning and ethical coherence. It would grant someone an eligibility for Dialectical Council candidacy and high-level governance influence. Those who had passed in this tier, would have an option to be an Aristocrats, in which they will gain further influence but also further responsibilities.

- Defines a stratified voting system where influence scales with demonstrated awareness. Since there's three-tiered programs of education, there would be a three-tiered voter, in which, it all consists of:

A. The Dialectical Citizenry (Base Level) – All Citizens

All citizens retain basic voting rights and can participate in public criticism forums. The Base level would have 50% of the whole vote. Every citizen has access to free dialectical training to enhance their awareness. Higher levels of influence are earned through demonstrated understanding.

B. The Conscious Electorate (Mid-Level) – Those Who Pass Awareness Tests

Individuals who pass Dialectical Awareness Tests receive greater voting influence in matters requiring deep analysis. They would have 25% of whole vote in general election. Members may propose or revise policies through structured debates. They are also the one who serve under Commission of Contradiction and Contingency Oversight, whose function is to supervise the government. This institution would be further explained in the next section.

Their Influence is not permanent—continued participation in dialectical education may required. Criminal record or absolutism may affect one's influence in this system.

C. The Candidates (High-Level) – The Aristocrats or Governance Elites

They are the candidate of key public officials: Dialectical Council member; Governor/Regional Administrator; Head of Government; Supreme Judicial Authority.

The Aristocrats composed of individuals with the highest dialectical awareness, selected through rigorous evaluation. They would also declare a Public Intent to be a candidate for key public offices. They cannot have criminal record in corruption, treason, financial fraud, or crimes against the people. They must be the subject to continuous ethical review by C3O and the Dialectical Council. Past political mistakes and ideological shifts may be scrutinized.

They must have demonstrated leadership in governance, law, activism, or systemic improvement. They could be nominated by Middle & Base voters if they exhibit dialectical wisdom. They must continuously prove their relevance in guiding policy.

The Aristocrats would have 25% of whole vote in general election.

No member holds permanent authority—each is subject to periodic re-evaluation and removal if contradictions emerge. There's a periodic assessment, and performance-based review for their activities.

- Every 5 years, Aristocrats must undergo a review to assess their continued eligibility.
- Review conducted by C3O + Dialectical Council + Peer Review from Other Aristocrats.
- Includes public engagement metrics—how their decisions impacted society.

For the Performance-based review, they would be subject to demonstrate active participation in dialectical governance.

Reviewed based on:

- Policy impact & systemic improvements.
- Ability to respond to emerging crises.
- Openness to dialectical challenge—no rigid ideological entrenchment.
- Public trust & feedback from Middle & Base voters.

Aristocrats can be immediately stripped of status if:

- They commit serious ethical violations (corruption, treason, betrayal of the people).
- They refuse to engage in dialectical self-correction and become stagnant.
- They become actively harmful to systemic stability.

The limit here is that they won't be able to initiate an emergency or People's Tribunal in the case of legitimacy crisis. The right to initiate an emergency council relies on Base and Middle Voter. The highest voters (candidates for key public offices) are subject to the People's Tribunal, meaning that they cannot hold direct influence over the Tribunal while it is in session. The Aristocrats also cannot be included within C3O, and must remains outside of it; except for the leader of C3O that is elected by the mid-voters.

To maintain fairness and prevent systemic stagnation:

1. Universal Access to Political Education – No financial or ideological barriers to participation.
2. Periodic Reevaluation (Every 2-4 Years) – Ensures influence is earned, not inherited. The second and third tier are evaluated accordingly to their class. Higher influence means more rigid assessment. This is also the case for the institution themselves; they must be subject to reevaluation by decentralized and independent panels every 1-2 years to expose contradiction that arises and refine them accordingly.
3. No Permanent Voting Status – Political influence is earned and maintained through engagement. Criminal record and absolutism may weaken one's influence.
4. Transparency in Influence Calculation – Results shall be publicly verifiable.

5. Challenge Mechanism – Any citizen may appeal their classification if they believe they were unfairly assessed.
6. Fluid Hierarchy – If 60% of Citizen pass Basic/Middle DAT's, the hierarchy changes from 50% 25% 25% into 60% 20% 20%.

Section 3: Mechanisms of Perpetual Revision and Accountability

This section ensures the legal and political system remains adaptable, self-correcting, and free from corruption.

Chapter 9: Periodic Evaluation of Leaders and Institutions

- Requires all public officials to undergo regular evaluations.

  When self-refinement and evolution becomes a demand, stagnation and contradiction itself became a vice in which it can make one's legitimacy decay. The idea behind refinement in this framework is that when we look at the lens of negativity, it is easier for one to look at the potential of refinement through flaws and contradiction rather than assuming perfectness or status quo. In this case, it is then must be the case that all public officials to undergo regular evaluation. Those who governs should prove themselves not through fixed system, but their ability to resolve a problem that occurs.

  It then would be appropriate to demand that all public officials to be reviewed periodically according to their role. The higher and influential a position is, the more rigorous the assessment are. A president, for example, are not reviewed for every term and can only be changed at the end of his term like in an election, but are calculated according to the contradiction that arises within his presidency. For example, for every contradiction that arises, they are determined by their severity and urgency; after that, the system of legitimacy decay would be assigned to the president or related officials, so that for within particular period of time (e.g. 1-3 month), they are required to address the reported contradiction. Else, they would face legitimacy decay and may be called into public hearing, in which they are forced to make a public statement in front of the court with the witnesses from the people. In this hearing, a president may give an explanation of why his contradiction persist, and what to do next. After that, they were given another time so that they will act as what he had promised in this hearing. If this contradiction still persists without any meaningful action, let's say after one or two years of presidency, they would face immediate removal without a revolution, and were changed accordingly.

  There's also regular periodic assessment, in which for every season (4-6 month), their performance were assessed by Commission of Contradiction and Contingency Oversight (C3O), in which the institution would be further discussed in the next section. This institution would have to assess general contradiction that has been solved and were still unaddressed under a presidency, and judge their performance.

  For every presidency there is, there's a risk of legitimacy decay that can activate a warning and potential removal from office, if the contradiction is ever ignored or even suppressed. The procedure of the removal should be democratic and transparent, in which it is based upon a clear evidence of suppression, dismissal, and accumulated

contradiction. This procedure would be carried by C3O via legal hearing in a court. This procedure are not merely limited on removal of office, but also legislative oversight, policy refinement, institution contingency, and all related matter regarding Law, Institution, and public officials. In this case, there'll be less incentive for stagnation and further ensure the evolution of society itself.

Chapter 10: Contradiction and Contingency Oversight

- **Committee of Contradiction and Contingency Oversight**

  Committee of Contradiction and Contingency Oversight (C3O) is an independent institution responsible for tracking, analyzing, and exposing contradictions within governance, law, economics, and ideology. Its purpose is to ensure systemic integrity by preventing stagnation, corruption, and ideological hijacking. Its also ensure the sustainability and structural contingency within government, so that no power remains self-referential and without accountability and are justified within valid reasoning.

  This institution does not solve problem directly, but rather reveal contradictions and legitimacy decays within governance to force accountability. It ensures that power justification remains valid instead of being fabricated. It will have its reports publicly accessible for transparency. Their reports would have no direct legal power in itself, but trigger hearings and public accountability mechanism. Citizen would be able to submit contradiction for review, and C30 would protect Journalists and whistleblowers under its mission.

  The existence of C3O would be mandated by law, so that its removal would cause legitimacy crisis for the government. Its existence is a basis for Structured-incompleteness itself, in which it reveals the lack within governance to further refine them. They ensure that government remains open-ended instead of being absolute. Its funding would be through taxes and independent donations. In the times of crisis of legitimacy, C3O can trigger hearing in Court, Dialectical Council, or People's Tribunal for replacement of public official or Law revision. They do not wield executive power in itself, but accelerates exposure of failing governance.

  C3O is a neutral entity in which their function is supervising current governance. They don't wield power in itself, but act as a plaintiff in the court for related matters. In a lack of better word, they are an institution in which they only exist as long as they are causing discomfort towards the government. They are permanent opposition in which, they are exists to make sure that the government of the whole structure itself remains open-ended, and can challenge Government if they are ever pass a law without a dialogue. Since this is an eternal opposition, its too doesn't make it immune to its own critique, and must be able to be dissolved, restructured, or refined as long as there's a contradiction. So it is not a static institution in which like all of traditional governmental institution, but kind of organization that can dissolve itself if it no longer serve its purposes at any current time given. So to preserve itself, it must remain vigilant.

  Its leadership would be chosen by second-class voters, and will remains rotational to prevent entrenched elites. The reason why only second-class voters are eligible in determining them or to applied in this institution, is because the writer thought about the nature of middle voters. They are too small to be rallied by populist rhetoric, yet too big to form an elitism. They are intellect that is still mingling with the common folk, in the lens of an aristocrat. They are representation of Idealism and Reality of Elites and

Common folk. In which, the writer believes that the power to influence the C3O, would be dependent on middle-class voters. The Legitimacy of C3O would be supervised by authority across multiple sectors as in, Legal Institutions, Academia, Civil Society Groups and Journalists alike.

To ensure structural protection, instead of single central authority, C3O should function as a network of independent regional offices that can continue its operation even if one branch is targeted. All of their findings would be publicly accessible, to ensure that any attempt to silence it triggers public backlash. Special protection should also exist for journalists and internal whistleblowers, ensuring that attempt to suppress information are exposed.

- Core Principle
  - Non-Permanence

    C3O must exists only when contradictions are empirically validated; dissolves when resolved. It's existence is dependent upon the existence of contradiction at current time. To prevent full dissolution due to a manipulated referendum, a legal minimum core structure (like a Public Contradiction Archive) could remain functional, ensuring that fundamental transparency survives even if the main body resets.
  - Crisis-Dependent

    C3O's structure are thrives on crisis, and dies in stability. Its perseverance requires distruption of status quo, in which it is based upon a reviewed and proven contradiction. C3O exists here as a 'ghost of crisis' in which, they are an alarm which the government has to address to preserve their legitimacy. C3O will get a further reward if they are managed to uncover a corrupt official, revoke a problematic law, or reveal a systemic contradiction. When stable, on the other hand, when a contradiction is managed, C3O oftentimes dissolve itself and leaving only records, before they would re-emerge as one node at time to address one particular contradiction.
  - Decentralized Swarms

    C3O doesn't consists of central institution in which traditional institution is formed. Instead, it acts as a 'team', Nodes that form, merge, or disband dynamically. For every node there is, is handling particular contradiction within current government. Several nodes can also band or disband dynamically according to the contradiction they face at given times. These node's existence are dependent upon empirically-proven contradiction and are consists of at least 8-12 member at minimal, consists of primarily middle-voters, opposition, and some expert on particular contradiction.
  - Adversarial Core

    But what if for example, the institution itself became redundant? In a way that, they just became an ideologically biased institution in the long run, preventing them to make a god case on the government that is align with their views? In this case, there's need to be some kind of a rule of which, opposition thinkers are embedded to prevent ideological capture. For example, more than a 1/3 of its member should be an opposition to the ruling government or the institution in which it is targeted. For example, let's say a node of C3O were established to capture the contradiction within a governmental institution, let's say ministry of education, while its policy were leaning unto progressives framework. In this case, more than 1/3 of the member of C3O must be ideologically opposed, like for example a conservative thinker, so that

there may be a contradiction that the Education ministry had missed. An enemy may knows you better than your allies, so in this case, C3O must embed an adversarial member to better stay dialectically opposed and exposing the contradiction.

- Empirical Mandate

  But merely an adversarial member can be biased also. One may make a report on a contradiction in which more ideologically driven rather than empirically based. This can make C3O redundant, in which, where its function supposed to be exposing a tangible contradiction within the country, it instead became a mere political opposition without some tangible backups. It should be the case then, that all actions of C3O require peer-reviewed, data-backed contradictions. This would be required for a prerequisite of an establishment of a node, so that a unit can properly address some tangible concern with an academic backup that are accountable and transparent. That would also be the case of reporting a contradiction, gaining evidences, and so on.

- Structure of C3O

1. Nodes: The Atomic Units

For the sake of efficiency and agility, one node should at least contain 7—12 member in accordance to the contradiction that is being exposed. The least amount of one node of C3O should be: Lead Investigator, 1–2 adversarial hires, 1 domain expert, 1 data analyst, 1 secretary, 1 mid-voter observer, and one Speaker related to human relation. In this case, each node are given autonomy to operate independently, but they may share data via a public ledger. This is for the sake of transparency to the public, so that there may be a public awareness to the situation they were in, so that so the public can gives their views not only to the government, but on the proof-of-work that were produced by C3O itself.

On handling a big threat to the society, nodes might merge into "super-swarms" (e.g., 3 nodes → 18–24 members). This is because I imagine that, the bigger the contradiction are, the more its overlaps with other systemic problem, so it is make sense that for such contradiction to occurs, there's the need of a joint operation from other related nodes to tackle those issues.

Candidates of C3O itself must pass a DAT's—solving real policy paradoxes under critique. The minimum for application would be that a member pass Advanced Awareness Evaluation; therefore, those who are eligible to become a member would be a Middle tiers voter or higher; with a rule that they cannot be a part of any political parties or have a political connection that would compromise their function. To prevent entrenchment, a term limit (1-2 years) with a cooling period of 2 years might be implemented.

2. Network Rules

Cross-Node Review: Contingency must remain to be the core principle of all institution, including C3O itself. In this care, nodes should audit each other's work; or there might be

a help for peer-review from academic/civil institution to value the work by a node. Contradictions between nodes trigger Dialectical Council review[4].

3. Resource Allocation

    - Pain-Gated Budget
      Because of how flexible it is to establish a C3O, there might be a concern on how should the resources be allocated. In this case, a gamification might be useful. For example, funds increase only if a node expose high-tier contradictions, or that inefficient nodes would have their funds dropped, in accordance to the tiers they tackle. C3O would have their legitimacy, thus their funding increases, only when it causes a dissonance within problematic government; moreover if it reveals a high-level scandal that has become the root of societal problem within a nation. The more the government fears C3O, the more they have justification and budget to continue to exists.

    - Existential Bounties
      But C3O cannot exists for the sake of existing; there ought to be a contingency for them if they ever misbehaved in their function. In this case, I would imagine that a citizens may be rewarded for proving a node's failures/inefficiencies. In this case, there is a competition within C3O so that they continually prove the validity of their justification to exists, or else a node will perish as their function no longer serve the people.

4. Adversarial Hiring Protocol
   Then we move onto the scope of C3O itself; how would we prevent an ossification of biases/ideology that compromise their function? In this case, there might be a rule in which 1/3 of node members must be ideological or practical opponents. From this, we institutionalized an opposition party that is outside the legislative (that oftentimes be structurally compromised by the ruling system), that were able to do its function properly outside the system, a kind of second-order supervisor. In this way, the discussion of contradiction within a country would have its real repercussion if a governmental policy are being implemented without an appropriate justification. A government must be able to prove its narrative to the people, or else they would face a legitimacy decay from the public.

5. Scorched Earth Mandate
   (Mandatory Annual Purges of Ineffectiveness)

[4] At this point, I realized that this model of governance is kind of a Kafkaesque state, that is highly recursive. In this case, I am pulled between the idea of contingent system that is complex, or simplicity of bureaucracy, in which, I choose the first, as per my goal is not a perfection in a sense, but to imagine a new kind of governance that might built upon the idea of contingency and systemic incompleteness. In this case, I would invite the reader to further critique this works, since it is, appropriately, incomplete in a sense. Every mistake is not meaningless, for it forces the system to learn.

If a C3O branch fails to resolve at least: tens of Tier 1 contradiction; or five of Tier 2 contradiction; or one Tier 3+ contradiction per year, it is dissolved or restructured. Bottom 10% of underperforming departments are defunded. Employees of failed departments must reapply under a restructured mandate—they do not retain automatic tenure or positions. "Failure" is determined by citizen oversight panels and rival investigative bodies to prevent internal bureaucratic shielding; in this case, C3O would require to cross-checked each other legitimacies.

With this structure, it would force constant crisis resolution—departments must remain effective or be restructured. This would eliminate careerist deadweight and entrenched inefficiencies. It would also encourage a survival-of-the-fittest approach to governance—C3O is built to fail and rebuild itself endlessly.

6. Anti-Procedural Poison Pills

   Every C3O protocol must expire annually unless at least 100+ citizens petition to renew it. If no renewal occurs, the policy is automatically abolished.

   This applies even to core operational procedures—nothing is permanently enshrined.

   Bureaucratic inertia is impossible because every function must be actively justified each year.

   This would:

   - Prevents zombie policies from lingering past their usefulness.
   - Forces public engagement—citizens must actively support policies they care about.
   - Encourages constant refinement and adaptation rather than blind adherence to precedent.

These refinements ensure that C3O is a living, adversarial entity that actively consumes its own failures. It exists to wage war against contradictions, weaponize opposition, and remain in a state of perpetual renewal—preventing institutional decay, ideological capture, and bureaucratic stagnation.

This is no longer just an oversight committee; it is a hostile governance mechanism designed to erode power structures through systemic self-destruction and regeneration.

- Rule of C3O

  1. Contradiction Validation

  Then one might ask, how would there be a structure? How should a contradiction be categorized within the framework of C3O? On handling contradiction itself, there must be a kind of hierarchy of urgency, so that the bigger problem can be resolved with appropriate immediacy correspond to the problems that arises within society. Bigger problem requires bigger emphasis, and less problematic require minor attention, so that the power doesn’t get lost on handling a small matters at hand, but actually diverted into a real systemic change. In this case, I want to divide a contradiction into 4 types that were also have its emphasize on budget, urgency, and all of its perks.

- Tier 1 (Minor)
  Minor inefficiencies (e.g., redundant paperwork). Resolution: 12 months.
  It must be the case that a node handling these matters must be specialized in bureaucracy rather than ideologically-based action against a policy. Since this is a small matter, albeit can affect the efficiency of the government, the existence of such node handling these matters can 'live longer' than its counterparts. That is also the case for its case; it doesn't require much of hard-bake empirical proof that is cross-referenced by other nodes to be resolves. The only justification for a case to be declared then, is by academic peer-review or other legitimate input.

  That being said, the budget that is given is lower than those nodes that handles more urgent matters. So by this logic, it must be that the existence of a node is proportional according to their budget; the more urgent a matter is, the more of existence of a node is having a shorter lifespan in accordance to their efficiency handling those matters at hand, so that's why there's a limit of resolution deadline for each node to exists.

- Tier 2 (Mild)
  Systemic inefficiencies (e.g. misplaced programs.). Resolution: 6 months.
  Since a misplaced program were more problematic than minor inefficiencies, it is more prioritized above Tier 1 contradiction; thus, alongside a bigger budget, there's a lesser amount of deadline in which, if a node fails to resolve this matter within said deadline, it would be restructured anew with the same goal albeit a different composition of member.

- Tier 3 (Acute)
  Systemic harm (e.g., electoral fraud). Resolution: 1-3 months.
  Systemic Harm, as the name itself defined, might require more teamwork than just a regular node. As such, when there's found to be a systemic harm that is backed with provable evidence, a node might group into a cluster, in which it would also activate their budgeting markup. But such activation cannot be declared arbitrarily; a grouping of a node or activation of Tier 3 alarm would require for other C3O to cross-reference their finding with each other. This is to prevent the fake reports that might harms the overall structure of C3O itself.

- Tier 4 (Existential)
  Regime collapse (e.g., coup). Auto-triggers People's Tribunal. Resolution: 1 month.
  In this case, Tier 4 contradiction would automatically triggers a Month of Dispute protocol, in which all problematic governmental are paused; no new law are being passed; and all new policies reverts back to pre-dispute rulings until the stability is reached. Further specification would be discussed in the next section.

After giving a category, a verification then must be acquired before categorization of a contradiction would occurs. A categorization must be verifiable and transparent, in such way that people can access it and account for it. In this case, the prerequisite for a contradiction to be registered is:

- Peer Review: 70% expert consensus.
- Public Evidence: Data must be replicable.

2. Escalation Path

Then how would a process of contradiction exposure happens? In this case, we the progress goes like this:

- Node Investigation → Public report + hearings.

  At first, there's a node that is established because there's an assumption of contradiction that is peer-reviewed. After exposure of Contradiction, there'll be a public hearing about the exposure of contradiction that is targeted to ruling class. In this case, the government have 3 options: either to justify their policy, reform, or double down on their misbehave. If it the latter or that the justification isn't enough, then Dialectical Council occurs.

- Dialectical Council → Overrides corrupt courts.

  C3O then sue the corrupt leader into the Dialectical Council for transgressing the law of Structured Incompleteness, using the proof that they had formalize into their report. In this case, the government needs to defend itself, or forced to reform if they are failed to provide a clear justification. DC can also override corrupt officials and replace it with another aristocrat (high-tier voter) to fill their roles, or revoke the corrupt policy and revert it back to previous version of ruling. If there is the case, however, that the DC itself is corrupt (abandoning the principle of structured incompleteness), then People's Tribunal are called. In this case, systemic reset might occur, where the default option would be a ruling before the corrupt policies were implemented and its corrupt officials are replaced, but then immediately dissolve itself if stability is returned. The discussion of People's Tribunal would be discussed more deeper in the next section.

3. Dissolution Triggers

Like where in a biology, there's a phenomenon called 'Apoptosis'. It is when a redundant cell is signalled to die so that it brings another chance of self-reproduction for the whole organ; else, a cell would became a carcinogenic; in a sense that, they change its own code of structure while retaining the same old signal, while appropriating the redistribution of nutrition for its own sake. To prevent that, a node from C3O must also have the capability to die when it is needed. We then look into the case where C3O are disbanded. Contrary to other institution that tries to preserve their own existence, C3O's node is re-created and disbanded purposefully to avoid redundancy. The reason why C3O needs to be removable is because if we make it a permanent institution, it would make them a ground for permanent and ossified institution that would transgress the very reason of it existence. This also the fact that decentralized nodes that is able to re-occurs to handle specifics contradiction like a swarm team is more agile and responsive rather than usual

bureaucracy. With this, the formation of C3O should be able to be disbanded in the case of it redundancy.

That being the case, since a node's purpose of existence is to resolve a contradiction via systemic pressure, if contradiction is resolved, they are to be disbanded after they made their last report that is transparent, so that it can be held accountable after formation. For example, if there's no Tier 3 exposure in 12 months, they will have an option of dissolvement or to be defunded since a contradiction in the forms of minor redundancy and misplaced program doesn't require as much time and energy to be pressed upon. It can also be the case that a node is made specifically for one case of contradiction that is happen to be tier 3-4 problem, and then disband when such contradiction had been resolved by leaving a last report. They strive when cause a systemic pressure, and a node can dissolve when there's stability upon a region or nation; with the exception of C3O's archive itself that handle the documentation of reports.

That being the case, corruption or transgress of law can disband a node of C3O when there's found to be one. For example, 2+ adversarial hires confirm malfeasance, or that they embezzled money or found to have a relation with problematic aristocrat, they are to be erased from ledger and disbanded. Such and such ruling would require further codification, but at this moment, the writer would make a rough sketches of what could It be, and then refine it in the next occasion.

- Ability and Limit

  We then move unto the abilities and limitation of C3O itself.

  What could it do and can't do to cause a systemic pressure upon the ruling class?

  1. Expose Contradictions

     C3O are able to identify and validate systemic flaws in governance, law, or policy using empirical data and peer review. That being said, the writer thought that C3O should able to access total transparency to Government, with the threat that act of concealment can cause more of systemic pressure.

     Aside from identification, C3O have the right to publish public reports that force hearings, lawsuits, or reforms to cause a systemic pressure upon the current ruling class, with a caveat that they must base their lawsuit with a proper empirical data and peer-reviewed proofs.

  2. Trigger Accountability Mechanisms

     Since their ability is to cause pressure upon the government, a node can escalate unresolved contradictions to:

     - Courts (if judiciary is functional).
     - Dialectical Council (DC) (if courts are corrupt).
     - People's Tribunal (PT) (if DC is compromised).

     Each escalation must be proven by contingent justification that is valid and transparent, so that the act of C3O can be made accountable to the public.

  3. Force Institutional Change

C3O can dissolve stagnant agencies via lawsuit, veto self-referential laws, and mandate policy revisions via court or other judiciary agency.
For example: A C3O node tackling an economic contradiction could block a corporate bailout by proving it violates anti-oligarchy laws via National Court or else.

4. Mobilize Public Pressure
   To give C3O further pressure on the ruling government, they must be granted a right to livestream hearings, release datasets, and empower whistleblowers to create irreversible scrutiny. Beside this consideration, it can also be the case that C3O itself cannot be another institution that handles 'secret' from the public. So in this case, the mobilization of the masses come at a price that C3O itself must not be above the pressure from the public, so that they can be held accountable while enacting their act against the government.

5. Self-Assemble & Disband
   Much like a Deluzian emergence, although 'institutionalized' rather than organic, nodes form when contradictions emerge, merge for existential threats, and dissolve when resolved. It must be the case that a node cannot exists indefinitely, because the consideration is that, the longer an institution exists, the more it prone to being captured by factions, and that it will act in accordance with biases rather than empirical proof of contradiction within a government.

What C3O **CANNOT** Do however:

1. Govern Directly
   No law-making, budget control, or executive power. They exists only as the exposure of contradiction, and proposal of revision, but they cannot enact a law as themselves. From a systemic perspective, C3O can only be a noise that must be metabolized into the structure of the system itself, and cannot be the other system. They cannot replace officials or laws—only force their removal or replacement via lawsuit.

2. Act Without Empirical Proof
   C3O must validate their act via justification of contradiction that is based upon:
   - Data (e.g., GDP collapse, election fraud stats).
   - Peer consensus (70% expert agreement).
   - No purely ideological or speculative accusations.

   Any act with no accountable basis would be put on trials and possibly conclude in a node's dissolution.

3. Override Legitimate Authority
   If courts, DC, or PT rule against C3O's findings, the node must accept it—unless new evidence emerges; however, if contradiction is still considered valid despite the contradictory ruling, it could put upon them a systemic pressure through radical transparency to the public, so they may able to put pressure via organic mass

mobilization that may conclude in another PT. But, C3O can't have the power except for their transparency and their right in lawsuit; and It is upon the organic masses they have their act against the government. C3O, only provide for the masses the justification to give rise to their emergence, just like an allergy that give reaction to the body.

4. Exist Without Public Mandate
   It cannot be the case that a node would occur in a way that is arbitrary. They must rely on mid-voter oversight, whistleblower input, and transparency. Even after such verification, it is upon the other nodes to give cross-check of the emergent node, both before, and in-between their operational duration. It is considered that such rulings may lessen the potential of a capture of C3O by a faction that have certain incentives that might disturb the process of contradiction exposure. As such, a node might dies if they are 'ignored' by another node or are starved from verified contradictions or peer-reviewed reports.

If such and such transgression of a node might be found, it is upon the other nodes or adversarial hires to dissolve it by a cross-checking mechanism. It can also be the case that a lawsuit may be directed towards a corrupted nodes that has become powerful with the proper evidence and peer-reviewed contradiction.

In practice, C3O is an institution that operate in a tightrope situation. They ought to be the immune system of governance—finding rot, forcing crises, then vanishing. They are allergent or irritation to the governmental system. Their existence is to affects the government in such a way they resolve the contradiction that occurs in between the government itself and the environment they're in. But they can bever the brain, heart, or hands of the state. C3O, is just the mirror of the government that is uncomfortable to them. Their effectiveness lies in proportional when a government fears them, and would fails to do their job when a government lies dormant because it doesn't disturb their unjustified power. C3O is a disruptor, not a ruler. Its power lies in making inaction more costly than reform.

That being said, it must be emphasized that a contradiction should be empirically proven rather than pure narratively-driven by the C3O. This is to ensure that a sufficient coherency is maintained and thus lessening its paralysation risk. It should be the case that any systemic pressure against a rulings, policies, or institution, should be backed by empirical systemic harm that causes material, positive losses in one way or the other, in order to address the systemic harm properly while maintaining a stability of a government, or else the balance would falls into that of chaos into anarchy, or into soft-totalitarian regimes. So there's a tight balance that should be maintained at all costs.

- Division
  But let's say there is a category for each nodes to assign to. In this case, I imagine that there'll be a division of department handling a contradiction on each case. For example, Department of Ontological Oversight, handles the contradiction in language, ideal,

promise, and action of an aristocrat; Department of Structural Contingency Oversight that supervise dynamic contingency in governmental bodies; Department of Material Oversight that handle anti-corruption, bribe, fraud, all things material. Department of Power Integrity and Abuse Prevention that is self-defined; Department of Informational Oversight that handles suppression of critique, ensuring transparency, Press and Freedom of speech, etc; Department of Sustainability Oversight that supervise sustainability of an act. Exploitation of nature, worker, space, etc; Department of Technological and AI Ethics; and Department of Refinement that exists to critique itself; receive critiques from society overall. Receive advisory from Academia and things.

But for the sake of agility, a C3O itself cannot be another institution that has the same structure as conventional organization. Their existence, albeit has the same function, must be emergent rather than established by itself like other institution. If it remains in the old structure, it would risk falls into control of a faction, or that it falls inefficient; handling only small matters instead of bigger problem. In this case, a structure of a C3O must be that of a Rhizome, that is emergent, and are budgeted by constitution itself. I imagine that for ach tax or governmental spending, a percent or less would be directed for C3O, in which their budgeting across nodes would be proportional to their contribution and contradiction they handles.

Section 4: Crisis Management and Emergency Protocols

This section defines how the system handles crises while preventing authoritarian exploitation of emergency powers.

Chapter 11: The People's Tribune and Emergency Oversight

1. Introduction

- Introduces the People's Tribune as an emergency oversight body.

  We had imagined how would this system work, if there's an accumulation of contradiction. But what if there's a case when the system itself become corrupt? What if, for example, the Dialectical Council itself has transgress the very law it supposed to hold? In this case, when the structured-incompleteness is transgressed, its second clause become valid, in which, it demands for resurrection of previous constitution. In this case, the systemic change would be carried not by Dialectical Council, but by the people itself via institutionalized People's Tribunal. They only emerge as crisis of legitimacy became prevalent within a country and there's the need for stability restoration. They are not a permanent institution but an emergency mechanism that arises only during a crisis of legitimacy. This happens when: The Structured Incompleteness principle is violated; The existing government becomes corrupt, self-referential, or stagnant. There is a need to restore legitimacy and prevent systemic collapse.
- The Function of People's Tribunal

  In this case, the function of People's Tribunal is one, to return the constitution back to its principle of Structured Incompleteness; second, is to replace the current officials that has became corrupted with other more viable replacement; third, is to ensure that the government return to its normalcy before crisis of legitimacy happens; fourth, is to

abolish itself after the normalcy has returned. It must be keep in mind that the existence of People Tribunal is to ensure that any changes within government, albeit may inevitably become violent, are structured in a way that doesn't causes much systemic harm that can freeze much of societal and economic activities of the commonfolk. Any act within People's Tribunal is to ensure that Governmental transition happens according to proper procedural process to brings the Structured Incompleteness back into the core foundation of society.

2. Activation

- Activation Condition

  It's activation are contingent upon at least one of these condition before moving into the next step:
  - Mass Public Petition → At least 1/4th of the total population (or 33% of Base + Middle voters) must formally sign a petition for Tribunal activation.
  - C3O Declaration of Legitimacy Crisis → The oversight body (C3O) verifies that the government has lost legitimacy due to systemic failures.
  - Electoral Fraud or Constitutional Breakdown → Evidence of massive election fraud, illegal extensions of power, or destruction of democratic institutions.
  - Widespread Civil Unrest → Large-scale, uncontrollable protests, strikes, or resistance movements indicate governance failure.
  - Military & Police Defection → Significant military or police forces refuse orders, causing a governance vacuum. In this case, the military should plead their vows not to Leader or a President, but rather the Structured Incompleteness itself to remains in checked, so that the moment crisis happened, control can be relegated to People's tribunal rather than the current ruler.
  - Silent Alarm → If 10+ regional C3O offices independently declare crisis by backed, empirical claim that is overlapping, Tribunal activates even without petitions.

- Pre-condition before Activation

  Before full activation, a smaller public vote determines whether the Tribunal process should move forward.
  - Public Approval Requirement → At least 10% of Base + Middle voters must vote to allow an official Tribunal Review Process to begin. This condition is excluded if it already petitioned by 1/4th of base + middle voters.
  - C3O & Legal Review → C3O, legal scholars, and independent auditors verify evidence before allowing a full Tribunal.
  - Cooling-Off Period → Cooling-off would be dependent on the condition of contingency within governance, based on how self-referential the government has become. It would be verified by C3O. If it severe (Coup, Dictatorship, Total Collapse) it is immediate. If it lower but still risk of power abuse and authoritarianism, 6 months. 1 year if it less, Low-Risk Crisis (Corruption, Legal Manipulation, but No Immediate Collapse). It would be decided by the amount of contingency within government.

- To prevent one region from forcing national activation, at least 1/3rd of all administrative regions must support the Tribunal. If regional, 50% of that region's voters must approve activation.

This prevents abuse and ensures the Tribunal is not misused for minor political disputes.

- Additional Safeguard

To further protect against abuse, these additional conditions must be met:

- Non-Elite Control → Only Base + Middle voters can trigger the Tribunal. Highest voters (elites) are excluded from activation to prevent self-serving manipulations.
- Transparent Public Process → Tribunal activation procedures and justifications must be publicly available to prevent secret manipulation.
- C3O Emergency Override → If the government violently suppresses activation efforts, C3O can bypass normal requirements and trigger a fast-track Tribunal process.

3. Member Selection

(A) Composition & Membership

The Tribunal is composed of multiple sectors of society to ensure fairness and avoid elite manipulation:

Sector	**Representation & Selection Process**
Elected Public Representatives	Chosen from **highest voters (key officials)**, but only **uncompromised officials** can participate.
Legal Experts & Judges	Independent members from **constitutional courts & legal institutions**.
Academics & Intellectuals	Scholars from **universities & research bodies**.
Civil Society Representatives	Human rights organizations, unions, and independent watchdogs.
Media & Journalists	Representatives from **press & investigative journalism** for transparency.
Citizens' Jury	A random selection of **citizens from Base + Middle voters**, ensuring public representation. They must pass DAT's before can be applied.
C3O's Representatives	The representation of C3O that brings the evidence of contradictions, and explains why it had happened.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Corrupt or impeached officials are banned from participating.
- Military leaders cannot serve in the Tribunal (to prevent military control over governance).
- Members cannot be affiliated with foreign governments or entities that compromise national sovereignty.

(B) 7-Rapid Response Member

One of the core mechanism of People's Tribunal is that once its activated, all the key governmental roles that had became corrupted is immediately frozen via the mechanism of 7-Rapid Response Member. In this case, RRM are 7 pre-vetted candidates of non-politically related individuals that is summoned via lottery as such, in which they contain several key roles with sufficient understanding of Law, Politics, and several other verified academic whistleblower. In this case, a pool formation must be made before the crisis to anticipate the case of constitutional crisis that may occurs in the future.

More simply put, RRM is drawn by lot from **pre-vetted Tribunal candidates**, ensuring both **randomness** and **competence** in crisis response. They are randomly selected from a **pre-approved pool** of **People's Tribunal candidates**, which consists of:

1) **Legal Experts & Judges (2 Seats)**
   Must have **experience in constitutional law, crisis arbitration, or transitional justice**.
   Prevents legal loopholes that a collapsing regime could exploit.
2) **Academics & Policy Analysts (2 Seats)**
   Experts in **governance, political science, and economic stability**.
   Ensures tribunal decisions **don't create secondary crises** (e.g., economic collapse).
3) **Journalists & Whistleblowers (1 Seat)**
   Investigative journalists with a **history of exposing corruption**.
   Guarantees **media transparency** and prevents backroom deals.
4) **Civil Society Representatives (1 Seat)**
   Human rights activists, union leaders, or community organizers.
   Ensures tribunal represents **public interests** rather than just experts.
5) **Randomly Selected Citizen (1 Seat)**
   Drawn from a **lottery of informed citizens** (e.g., those who pass DAT).
   Prevents the tribunal from becoming **an elitist legal bureaucracy**.

Then, how would we have an access to the Pool of readily-available RRM? In this case, a Pool Formation at the time before crisis had to be maintained to have the reserves readily available in the times of constitutional crisis.

Phase 1: Pool Formation (Pre-Crisis)

A proposal would then that a nationally maintained list of 100 Tribunal-Eligible Candidates is constantly curated and updated. This is not a permanent appointment, but a rotating, renewable 2-year term of eligibility.

Composition of the 100-Person Pool:

COMPOSITION BREAKDOWN

Sector	Slots	Selection Method	Notes

Sector	Slots	Selection Method	Notes
Legal Scholars & Judges	20	Nominated by national law associations + public vote	Must have no active party membership or current state appointment
Policy & Academic Experts	20	Peer-reviewed panels in political science, economics, philosophy	Minimum 10 years of published work or teaching
Journalists	15	Selected via journalist guilds + public oversight board	Must have broken at least 1 major corruption or abuse story; or other verified records.
Civil Society Leaders	15	Vetted by coalitions of NGOs, unions, and civic movements	Activists, NGO leader, Union organizer. At least 10 years community organizing or resistance track record
Verified Whistleblowers	10	Selected via C3O verification & historical review	Verified individuals with history of exposing corruption or abuses. Protected identities allowed; at least one confirmed public disclosure.
DAT-Passed Citizens	20	Lottery from pool of passed DAT (Democratic Aptitude Test) takers	50% renewed every 2 years via new lottery

This pool is publicly known but maintains security anonymization layers in case of surveillance. It should be the case that the public can hold accountable in the case that some candidates were corrupted; hence the transparency of such. To maintain further safeguard then, it is the case that a candidate of RRM should not have any ties to political parties or governmental officials; especially to the hitherto regime.

Now that we have a standing pool of 100 pre-vetted Tribunal candidates, it must be maintained, so that when a crisis triggers the Tribunal, 7 members are drawn randomly from this pool are readily available.

Each drawn member must accept or decline within 24 hours. If a drawn member declines or is unavailable, a replacement is immediately drawn.

Phase 2: Activation & Selection

When a national emergency or coup crisis is declared—via petition threshold or 10+ C3O branches' independent declarations—the Emergency Subcommittee is instantly drawn.

Lottery Algorithm draws 7 members from each key category above (except 2 policy experts, not 1). This would ensure interdisciplinary coverage of key governance transition. After getting drafted, the drawed must accept or decline within 24 hours. Refusal, inaccessibility, or conflict of interest triggers instant redraw from their category. The draw overseen by C3O's digital watchdog system, with cryptographic transparency (e.g. blockchain ledger of draw event for audit).

To further safeguard the RRM from insurrection, Rotation and Renewal Rules would be that

- a Member cannot serve on Subcommittee more than once every 10 years.
- After 2-year eligibility in the pool, must wait 3 years to requalify.
- Citizens can nominate themselves or others, but approval into the pool requires:
  - Vetting by a non-partisan Review Board (drawn from academia, civil groups, and C3O)
  - DAT if applying as citizen representative
  - Transparent public posting of accepted applicants

The core principles of such ruling is that it will provide a necessary protocol to prevent further crisis. On the times of constitutional crisis, the most dangerous thing for a nation is to have a faction uses the chaos to legitimize their rule; whatever good their will is. In this case, there's a subcommittee in which, freeze all corrupted/disputed rulings and legitimacy of a key officials, and prevents the further spiralization into chaos.
As the name had implied, RRM have a limited times of a week (7 days) to freeze all assets of corrupted officials, delegitimize their rule and postpone them until a temporary replacement is installed, and to reverts back all rulings into pre-dispute policies and rulings. In this week, a Tribunal is also prepared for 100-200 member of PT to be gathered in one place to decide the transition of a government, and to judge the matters that had been disputed per constitutional crisis where DC as the Supreme Court itself had become contradictory by verified proof of the academics, and not upholding to principle of Structured Incompleteness.

(C) Tribunal Member

A Tribunal member, aside from RRM, is an assembly in which, decides the matter regarding the constitutional crisis and held a court or hearing towards problematic key officials that had become the vortex of disputes. For the standing reservoir, it is derived from the same pool as previous member.
The pool is a **standing reservoir of vetted emergency deliberators** capable of responding rapidly to systemic crises—e.g., coups, regime collapses, or legitimacy breakdowns—via temporary executive emergency action **without forming a permanent elite.**

ROTATION & TERM RULES

- **Term Length**: 2 years
- **Cooling Period**: After term, 3-year ban on re-selection
- **Annual Refresh**: 50 new members selected each year (rolling entry/exit to avoid total reset)
- **Resignation Clause**: Any member can opt out at any time, replaced by next eligible in their category
- **Blacklist Rule**: Any person who has served in executive office in the last 5 years is ineligible

---

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CAPTURE

- **Multi-source vetting**: No single body can dominate nominations
- **Public Audit Ledger**: Names, background summaries, and selection logs are published
- **Opposition Clause**: 10% of pool must be known critics of the current regime/government structure
- **Staggered Entry**: Ensures ideological and historical diversity within the pool

---

LEGAL ENTRENCHMENT

- Pool mandated in constitution as **"neutral crisis safeguard body"**
- Pool cannot be abolished without triggering automatic **People's Tribunal formation**
- Removing more than 10% of the pool without process = treason-level violation

---

TIES TO C3O

- C3O regional offices nominate **1 observer** per region to verify that pool remains ideologically balanced and free from institutional capture.
- Reports from C3O about bias, stagnation, or elite capture in the pool can trigger **partial restructuring.**

4. Crisis Resolution Workflow

We had provided the rough structure of what a PT would be theoretically. Now, we will examine the process of which, a resolution of Constitutional Crisis might follow accordingly. I would call this a Month-of-Dispute Protocol, in which, as the name sounds, might occurs in the 30-days period.

Month-of-Dispute Protocol: From Freezing to Ratification

This one-month emergency workflow ensures a **swift, transparent, dialectical judgment** of a legitimacy crisis—while protecting the populace and avoiding endless upheaval.

---

1. Rapid Response (≤ 7 days)

At the beginning of activation of People's Tribunal via declaration or other justified means, soon all of the 7 Rapid-Response Member began to be elected by random lottery. After some election had occurs, they would be congregated into PT and then granted power to freeze the government without causing much harm. After that, all policies/governmental roles that had caused disputes were temporality voided with the basis of verified contradiction from C3O and other entities such as anti-corruption NGO's etc. With this, the 7-RRM were granted the power to:

- **Freeze Authorities:** Suspend implicated offices and revoke official seals/credentials.
- **Asset Freeze:** All personal and institutional assets of targeted officials are locked.
- **Automatic Voiding:** Any ruling, decree, or policy proven contradictory is immediately voided and reverted to the pre-dispute status.
- **Interim Governance:** Appoint neutral Civic Administrators (from C3O-certified technocrats) to handle essential services.

In this case, systemic corruption is "paused," contradictions are laid bare, and essential functions continue under neutral oversight. To further emphasize, **an emergency freezing act that were imposed by the RRM cannot be justified to make a new law in any way/form**; they can only enact an act of governmental pause to minimize the harm**.**

---

2. Quorum Ratification (Days 8–30)

Once freezing is complete, the full People's Tribunal convenes to deliberate and ratify actions. In this phase, all member of the PT should attend the designated place, to hold a hearing against specified problematic government official if possible, to hold the case against them and to give them chance to justify their act. Whether the specified individuals might or might not attend the hearing, any ratification would occur regardless. These ratifications are divided into three categories in accordance to their need; the sole principle here is to brings back Structured Incompleteness into the constitution; expungement of problematic laws; a restructuring if needed; and to brings back stability into the nation.

The first categories is Targeted Voiding, in which problematic policies/roles that is reported to have a contradiction is automatically voided and to turns back the structure of the government into pre-dispute state. This would not require much debates as a verified contradiction would be procedurally expunged. The second category is Targeted Restructuring and Ruling. In this case, there's an external Legitimacy Lend Rule, in which, public supports should be maintained above 40% to be enacted; else, any ruling of re-structuring would be voided. This is to prevents the

totalitarianism that is justified by the crisis, and to 'irritate' the PT to make a case aligning with general populace. This supports of course, are counted only in the hierarchy of base and middle voters; excluding the aristocrats to prevents power entrenchment or mobilization. The third categories is a Total Regime Dissolution. In this case, a regime might have entrenched their power through legal process that is undeniably causes contradiction, like in the case of Germany in 1933. In the history, Hitler came to power through legal means, specifically through the Weimar Republic's legal and political processes, though not through a majority vote. He was appointed Chancellor by President Paul von Hindenburg in January 1933. The Nazis gained increasing support through elections, eventually becoming the largest party in the Reichstag. The Enabling Act, passed by the Reichstag, further solidified his power by allowing him to govern by decree, effectively dismantling the democratic structures. Here, we can see how a total structure of the government is flawed in the sense that: according to the system's logic, it is valid. Yet, looking at the material exclusion that had occurs, the process then causes a system to allows for a totalitarian regime to rose in power and restructure the government itself. In this case, People's Tribunal have the right to enact Total Regime Dissolution that reshapes the structure of the government and those who are in charge of the government that had became corrupted. But a massive change also requires equivalent condition, so in this case, total regime dissolution would only occur in condition with Super Majority and maintaining public supports.

Decision Type	Internal Quorum	Vote Threshold	External "Lend" Rule
○ **Targeted Voiding**	≥ 50% members present	Simple majority with prescription of verified contradiction. (50% +1)	N/A — rapid-response voids stand regardless of public support
○ **Targeted Restructuring & Rulings**	≥ 50% members present	Simple majority	New restructuring measures risk void if **public support** (real-time blockchain polling) falls below 40%
○ **Total Regime Dissolution**	≥ 50% members present	Supermajority (≥ 66.7%)	Must also maintain ≥ 50% public lend at time of vote; if support dips < 40% within 30 days, decision voids

- **Internal Quorum**: At least half the Tribunal must attend for votes to be valid.
- **External "Lend" Model**:
    - Real-time public support is tracked on a blockchain-backed ledger, facilitated by C3O.
    - If support falls below 40%**,** any *new* restructuring votes are voided (but original rapid-response voids remain in effect).
    - **Public support can rebound**—C3O facilitates petition drives to "re-lend" legitimacy to further reforms.

This would maintain that a minor corrections and policy tweaks sail through quickly; full regime change requires broad consensus both inside the Tribunal and among the citizenry.

---

3. Stabilization & Dissolution

- **One-Month Sunset**: After stability had been reached; preferably at the end of the month, the Tribunal **automatically dissolves**, its emergency powers expire, and:
    - Unexecuted proposals lapse.
    - Government returns to neutral status under the reinstated (or newly ratified) constitution.
    - C3O resumes its role as perpetual critic and contradiction-tracker.

- Conditions for Dissolution

    - Restoration of Democratic Legitimacy → If a new election is held or governance is stabilized.
    - Completion of Judicial Actions → If corrupt leaders are removed and judicial reforms are enacted.
    - Public Confidence Restored → If citizen petitions indicate sufficient trust in governance.

The crisis is resolved within a fixed timeframe. No "permanent revolutionary council" forms—power either reverts into pre-dispute structure or is reconstituted under clear, ratified rules.

Why This Works?

- **Speed & Precision**: Rapid Response "freezes" corruption in under a week; full deliberation completes in 30 days.
- **Layered Legitimacy**: Internal majorities handle targeted actions; supermajorities plus public "lend" safeguard against rash regime change.
- **Public Engagement**: Real-time support metrics keep the citizenry actively involved without endless referenda.
- **Structural Incompleteness**: Fixed sunset prevents new ossification—the Tribunal itself must vanish or be re-mandated by public crisis.

5. Contingencies

We had laid down on the prerequisite of how would PT were called into being, its structures, and how would it will act; but what if there's more than 1 party that is declaring? Suppose +10 C3O were declaring a Legitimacy crisis, and in the meantime 1/4th of base+middle population were declaring it with an opposite justification? In this case, there is a contradictory declaration in

which, there's need to be an arbitrator to resolve this procedural error. For that, I imagine that there'll need an outside judiciary beyond state's territory.

When two or more factions declare a legitimacy crisis (e.g., C3O vs. a corrupt Dialectical Council), the system invokes an external judiciary body from another state/non-state entity.

For the selection of arbiters, we need a preferably non-state entity that isn't tied to any faction. A pool of pre-selected arbiters of neutral microstate, indigenous commune, anarchy societies, or other stateless network. This is to prevent proxy or contradicting interest from powerful state. Its selection would be a random lottery with decentralized registry. The selected preferably shouldn't have economic/political ties to major power or disputing factions.

For a month of the dispute, the flagged laws that has become dispute are void, and revert back to pre-dispute laws temporarily. In this month, there'll be a 3 day for each faction to gather evidence and necessary proof. After that, a week of arbitration would be commenced.

After 3 days of preparation, on day 4-5, both factions submit evidence (e.g., laws violated, empirical harm, suppression of critique). All documents are publicly logged (no secret arguments).

On day 6-8, referee reviews only procedural validity (not policy preferences): Did one side clearly violate structured incompleteness; Is the crisis declaration backed by empirical proof (e.g., data, peer audits)?

On the last 9-10th day, issuance of Verdict would be commenced: Binary outcome: Only validates one declaration as legitimate (no compromises). No recommendations: Only states which faction's claim is constitutionally valid.

After this verdict, The People's Tribunal (PT) inside the country executes them. A PT then dissolves the illegitimate declaration, and proceed with winning faction. Referee disengages immediately; they would have no further role except for providing procedural verdict.

If no verdict in 7 days, PT triggers a emergency referendum (all citizens vote on crisis validity). If referee is caught in bias, PT voids the process and selects a new arbiter. If a decision are already being made after Month of Dispute, but arbiters were found to be biased, it is upon the role of C3O via hearing to determine if a stability and change is sufficiently doesn't cause systemic harm that can cause instability, and that a proposal to restructure of PT to close the flaw of said external arbitration should be enacted. If, however, there's found to be instability of said decision from PT that are biased and the need for immediate restructuring, activation would still require a pre-condition of consent from the public, and the cooling off period would be dependent on amount of contingencies within the government.

6. Power and Limit

In summary, the power and limitation of People's Tribunal are as follows:

- Power
  1. Overturns Illegitimate Elections → If election fraud is proven, it annuls results and orders new elections.
  2. Impeaches Corrupt Officials → Removes leaders guilty of treason, corruption, or dictatorship.
  3. Declares Military & Police Realignment → Can temporarily restructure the armed forces to prevent a coup.
  4. Mandates Legal Reforms → Orders constitutional changes to restore lawful governance.
  5. Reinstates Public Order → Coordinates with citizens and law enforcement to stabilize governance.
- Limit
  - No Permanent Governance Role → The Tribunal must self-abolish once stability is restored.
  - Cannot Rewrite Constitution Alone → Any major legal changes must be ratified by public referendum.
  - No Executive Control → It cannot take over daily governance, only correct failures.
  - Time-Limited → The Tribunal has a fixed operational period (e.g., 6 months to 1 year).

Chapter 12: On Emergency Power and "Necessary Dictator"

- What is considered emergency?

  How would a martial law be enacted in this system? We know that the trap of nations from the pasts is that chaos can inevitably birth a tyrant if not handled correctly. So in this case, how would an emergency power works in this system? We then have to define what is considered an emergency in the first place.

  In the mainstream system, an emergency law can only be enacted if the core of the system is threatened by an alien variable in which disrupt or even potentially harms the existence of the structure, including its subject. This can manifest in different forms; one of such examples is an invasion from stronger countries or an illegitimate coup by the military, or that it can be other threat of Global Pandemics that requires mass coordination. Some of internal threat might be possible to be handled by People Tribunal or Dialectical Council itself; but if such existential threat that requires a mass coordination would occurs, we might need to build a temporary structure of 'necessary dictatorship' like that kind of ancient Rome.

  But first, we need to properly address, what kind of situation that would be considered an emergency itself? It might seem obvious at start; until you realize that without proper definition, a bad actor might inevitably use the justification of 'crisis' and thus overriding the governance into proper totalitarian state for a lifetime. Such is the case with much of historical takes on various empire and nation, including Roman Empire itself.

  The key to make a proper definition is first, to have a proper image on what should be the goal of this definition? And from that, we can make a proper criterion for defining a crisis in which it is justified for an emergency power to exist beyond normal governance.

We need to ask: what is the definition of a crisis in the first place? In my vision, a state must be that of a Non-Newtonian fluid: it changes its structures as usual perturbance occurs, like how an irritant drives self-reproduction of a system, yet become hard-structured when a great force struck the surface of it. Thus, like that of a strike, an emergency crisis is a situation where a great perturbance strikes a nation and causes significant impact, that causes instability is several sectors of society, usually in a short amount of time. To contain such impact from harming the overall structure then, a decisive act must be made. This is what I would define an emergency power: an equal measure against equal strike that harms the organs to contain the disruption from harming the overall existence of said structure; usually at the costs of overriding the usual law itself, like that of an immune system that might override the structure to keeps the body alive, and were deactivated when the status quo comes back after crisis.

Derived from this definition then, a crisis that requires an emergency power can be categorized by:

a. Existential Threat
   That there's a variable/event in which it disrupts the stability of the common in which it materially harms the overall structure that results in a real statistical victim; especially territorial integrity (invasion, civil war); constitutional order (collapse of ≥ 3 branches of government), or survival of ≥10% population (pandemic, famine).
b. Immediacy
   A threat is occurring at a real time rather than hypothetical threat. Excluding an ideological threat, a threat must be material and are affecting the general populace at such rapid escalation where the response of a normal government would lag behind and necessarily insufficient.
c. Irreversibility
   A potential damage of such threat must be that it would be permanent if left unchecked (e.g., infrastructure annihilation; global pandemic).
d. Empirically tested
   Such threat that necessitate an emergency power must also be backed by a real evidence of said existential threat of a governance that can be empirically proved by reasonable metrics that is considered objective. The evidence therefore, must be able to be replicated by any faction within the governance for it to be valid.

As such, it is also necessary to explicitly exclude **what is not considered an emergency threat** to deter the activation of emergency power by unjustified motivation.

1. Political Disputes & Governance Gridlock
   Legislative deadlock (e.g., failure to pass budgets, policy disagreements) are not to be part of legitimate justification to declare an emergency, as such problem would have its resolution in mediation by Dialectical Council, or other public deliberation forums/judiciary.

Such also the case for election disputes (unless systemic fraud affects ≥30% of votes), and leadership scandals (corruption, impeachment trials). If, however, the problem is systemic and were under 3rd tier contradiction, an activation of Month of Dispute may follow with proper justification and basis from C3O or other possible means.

2. Civil Unrest & Protests

   Peaceful protests, including Labour Strike, regardless of size or cause, should be protected at any case. It is not without a cause that a peaceful protest would suddenly turns into violence; or even if it descent into one. Usually, a progression of mass unrest usually comes at a price of dismissal from the demanded; or that there's usually a variable of an agitator in which worsen the situation. In this case, per structured incompleteness, it is upon the C3O and Government to hold a hearing from a protest to form an arbitration or negotiation. Police can only intervene in violence, targeting only the agitator without supressing the mass, because more often than not, it only made things worse.

   That is also the case for Riots; unless that at around 1/10th of population experience armed insurrection that possibly results in casualties and further instability if not contaminated, a riot would be handled with Localized law enforcement without federal emergency powers.

3. Economic Fluctuations

   Recessions (unless paired with currency collapse or banking system failure), Stock market crashes, and Inflation (<50% currency devaluation in 30 days) are not to be considered a valid justification for an emergency power to be declared, since its resolution can be mitigated by policy adjustments, reforms, or stimulus packages.

4. Public Health & Social Issues

   Pandemics (unless ≥5% mortality rate or healthcare collapse), or Drug Epidemics – although would demands the government to act as quickly as possible to prevent more casualties – cannot be the justification for a crisis emergency, as such cases can be mitigated by public health measures and other preventive and curative measures. If, however, through the investigation of the C3O backed by provable evidence, the government were to be found lacking in response to the health crisis, it is either upon the government to retrieve their legitimacy through proper response via technocrat in their respective fields; or that the legitimacy would be taken away; either by Dialectical Council based on the violation of structured incompleteness, or by People's Tribunal that immediately give the authority in their respective fields, to the specialists relevant to the urgent matter at hand.

   Moral panics (e.g., religious, cultural, or ideological conflicts) were also excluded for a basis for crisis declaration; as such problem can be mitigated by protected discourse with no state censorship; unless that certain material were **empirically found** to be coming from bad actors, like that of a part of espionage or sabotage.

It need to be pointed that this categorization remains debatable; as there's too much exclusion were to be made upon a principle of 'real threat'. However the case, the principle of falsifiability must be taken as a highest principle of justification that necessitate the need for an emergency power, as it is to prevent any factions from using said justification and power against constitutional right, however noble their will seems to be: that is, by trespassing the principle of Structural Incompleteness.

- How would the mechanism of these emergency power handle itself?

Chained Leviathan Protocol

1. Prologue
   Threat Detection and Dual-Lock Authorization
   Public Challenge Period

2. Dialogue
   Technocrat Appointment
   Resource Allocation

   Glass Box Protocol
   (C3O oversee weekly)
   Progressive Escalation Locks

   Contingency

   Re-Verification for every month

3. Epilogue
   If weekly report of cluster of C3O's had audited that the threat had been contaminated and can be managed on normal governance without needing an emergency power, C3O then began reporting a file on Dialectical Council, in which they then revoke or pause the privileges of the appointed Dictator, and then began reassessment of said situation. If the problem was mitigated normally, the power turns back to the previously elected president/prime minister, and thus began another reassessment for the previously mandated command by the appointed dictator. If this reassessment prove that the appointed were abusing their power contradicts to their previous role/justification for their enactment, then they were banned from future offices and their excess wealth/power is confiscated by the state. On the other side, if the assessment proves that the appointed were trustworthy, they would receive a fair sum of payment and other reasonable merits.

- Prohibits emergency leaders from extending their rule beyond crisis resolution.
- Introduces automatic checks to dissolve emergency powers once stability is restored.
- Requires that all emergency decisions be reviewed and reversed if necessary.

Section 5: The Right to Knowledge and Universal Education

This section ensures access to knowledge is a universal right, preventing monopolization and ideological control.

Chapter 13: Knowledge as a Universal Right

- Establishes free access to political, scientific, and dialectical education.
- Prevents information from being controlled by political or economic elites.
- Recognizes knowledge as a fundamental human right.

Chapter 14: Preventing the Monopolization of Knowledge

- Ensures no single institution controls access to information.
- Mandates transparency in education, media, and governance.
- Establishes decentralized education networks to prevent ideological indoctrination.

Chapter 15: Public Debates, Writings, and Epistemic Contributions

- Encourages citizens to contribute to public discourse through debates and publications.
- Allows political influence to be earned through intellectual and ethical contributions.
- Establishes public platforms for critiquing and refining governance.

Section 6: Structural and Legal Safeguards

This section contains legal mechanisms to prevent systemic failure, stagnation, or authoritarian collapse.

Chapter 16: Mechanisms for Role Circulation and Removal

- Requires periodic leadership rotation to prevent entrenched power.
- Mandates automatic dismissal for officials who fail dialectical evaluations.
- Ensures governance positions remain open and accessible to all competent citizens.

Chapter 17: Governmental Hijack

- Governmental Contingency

  What if the government were hijacked? Let’s say, by invasion? I imagine that, if this state were invaded, the ruling class then would have to gain legitimacy by handling crisis; or that the society would become a structured anarchy. Invader doesn't just occupy territory: they were handed new responsibility or else; by the constitutional reboot (i.e. if this structured incompleteness is void, the constitution is invalid and must revert back to structured incompleteness)

When an invader arrives, they are not met with a population awaiting submission, but a population trained in contradiction analysis who will immediately evaluate:

- Does the invader resolve contradictions, or create new ones?
- Can the invader justify their rule, or are they self-referential?

If they impose authority without critique, they trigger the PT (People's Tribunal) and constitutional reset.

Since the Constitution is Contingent on structured incompleteness, it would means that, if a ruling authority tries to lock the system, or abolish critique, it voids its own foundation.

Therefore, any static regime, even a foreign occupation, automatically becomes illegitimate unless it re-validate:

- C3O presence
- Open critique cycles
- Procedural dialectics

Otherwise, the system reverts to "structured anarchy", meaning:

- Local self-rule through pre-crisis Law that is justified.
- Rotating dialectical councils like before, but modulated and localized.
- Rebuilding of state only via dialectical legitimacy

This would mean that, to rule the Asymptotic State is to become it; And if you fail to become it, the nation would dissolve yourself, or the invader is considered 'illegitimate' to rule.

- Structured Anarchy

If central authority collapses and invaders can't govern, then Society defaults to C3O swarms, decentralized government, and PT conveners who maintain some functions of statehood without hierarchy.

- Local dialectical federations continue operating.
- Laws return to pre-failure state.
- No warlord, party, or foreign power can hold legitimacy unless they are continually justified.

So rather than civil war, what we get is highly organized resistance through logic, not just arms. The people are governed not by a person, but by the contradiction. Every rule must be contingent, and in the case of governmental hijack, to uphold that very rule, it must be

the case that self-referential rule is considered illegitimate and thus, must form another contingent provisional government that is opposite to the new ruling class.

Section 7: Culture; Modulation

Chapter 18: Assimilation of Critique into Culture

- **Gamification of Critique**
  Rather than Static=Stable, it must be the case that Stability equals Change, like a flow of river. I imagine that without cultural modification, constant political change would make its people exhausted. In this case, there's need to be a work around the assimilation of critique into everyday societies. One of the way it can be achieved is by gamification of critique, for example for every semester, there's a competition for the masses to expose 'the stupidest law' with its reason, and the winner would gain some recognition and profits.
- **Evolving Art and Architecture**
  When Structured incompleteness become a culture, an Art also follows. Art must resonate with the heart of another human instead of being self-referential and hollow. City also redesigned by structured incompleteness, when modular blocks and building were established, in the philosophy that this design is still a 'beta-version', that can be changed according to its function towards society and nature.
  Beauty must irritate the system and not merely exists as a form of appreciation; it must be the case that vibrant matter should be used to irritate the structure of humanity itself so that they share the characteristics between nature and human itself: that they evolving. It is not enough to tell that matter lives for their own; we ought to side with it or else swallowed by the nature itself because we're not register their suffering. It is upon the responsibility of human itself that we choose to either evolve with nature or decay with a stone monument that is already eaten by moss. Praxis must be acted upon, so that the structure self-reproduce themselves enough so that the noise became part of its signal without an end. an architecture must be made in mind that it too must evolve in accordance to its environment. A city must breathe and grow like a forest. Not to make nature subordinate, but collaboration with. The design of a product must not harm its environment, or to be planned with obsolescence: they must be modular. It's either we ought to irritate the structure, or to be destroyed by the noise of these vibrant matter around us.
  It is no longer a choice; for every aesthetics is already a form of politicization of a stance to defend beauty against its depreciation. To be complacent with its beauty while act nothing on its destruction is to stand with the oppressor that is stomping their boot on a flower.
- The Art of Kintsugi and its Philosophy

Chapter 19: Modulation

Modulation of Institution (Ostorm)

Section 8: Conclusion

- **An Anarchy through State**
  What do you think would happens if a state continuously refine itself till death? For every contradiction there is, it is a pathway forward? When every system becomes contingent upon something greater than itself? And Refinement is the only path forward?

  The Hierarchical Democracy. What if the hierarchy is fluid? Instead of fixed 50%/25%/25% vote weights, let the ratios adjust based on participation? If 80% of citizens pass BDCT (Basic Test), shift to 60%/20%/20%. What do you think would happens if all subjects then pass the advanced Dialectical Awareness Test? When all subject becomes philosophers, there's no need for hierarchy anymore, since all subject became aware. There will be no use of hierarchy anymore, and all then return to Mature Direct Democracy. The state becomes so good at eliminating contradictions that it eventually erases itself.

  I think, at the end, if all subject within a Nation then were aware enough, they would become self-organized without the state. The state would only become an invisible federation that proposes resources realignment and things without coercion. The state then, fight against all system that is self-referential, oppress. Then, at the end of times…
  …The anarchy would soon emerge, without violence, but with maturity. This system basically turns all societies into Zapatista commune in the long terms. Government would only emerge as needed when a contradiction emerges, and not as necessity. I Imagine that this anarchy would not be a pure anarchy like we recognize, but founded upon the same principle of Structured Incompleteness. When there's a contradiction that necessitate a structure, the state apparatus with C3O and PT would emerge once again like an immune system, before it once again be refined and into anarchy. In this case, anarchy is not given, but earned, and can sometimes reform into a state. A kind of Schrödinger State, where it is both a state and anarchy until you look at its inner mechanism.

  And at the end? If all systemic oppression disappears, what would we fight against in the end?

  The Ego. The Ego that holds ourselves back, holding our true self to our true potential that cannot be dismissed by reason. The final synthesis, that there's no greater reference point aside from the Truth; beyond reason itself.

  By simple premise: You need something else to determine your truth. You are not perfect, not a God, but precisely because of that you'll be happy knowing that your journey would be endless.

- Apoptosis, Carcinogenesis, Metastatis, and CRIPSR

Let's try defining it a phenomenon upon Luhmannian structural coupling; a system interact with each other via structural coupling based on the agreement of logic system (code) that is perceived by both. This is how an environment is created. Now, an ontological theft (or to be precise, Functional Theft) is a communicative act of a system where, one system self-mutilate itself to remains cohere in response of the irritant that risk compromise its identity or operational closure, yet still transmitting the same old code to other system, while operating on the new mutilated code. It then results in systemic decoherence as such, that other system were alienated from others code; since part of their signal become a noise to the system that self-mutilate itself to remains cohere. a structure that previously build upon self-reproduction of the same logic to acquire grater coherency of noise and functional capabilities, now are decoupled from each other while one system simulate its old code, and the other system still receiving it as a signal as such; in contrast that the newer system just become a noise.

For example in Biology, in a normal occasion, when a healthy cell is become redundant, it is going through a phenomenon called apoptosis, where a cell is dies so that a new healthy cell emerge anew. Now, when that healthy cell is faced with an irritant, let’s say a carcinogenic substance, to preserve its function, a cell then rewrites its own code to preserve its existence. A healthy cell then become a cancer. In a phenomenon called Carcinogenic.
A cancer cell still emits its old code of healthy cell to gains nutrition from its other organs, while self-replicating its own code that had differed from previous iteration to preserve its operational closure in the face of external irritant. An ontological theft therefore, can also be called a Carcinogenesis. A theft does not happen in the self-reproduction of code between system itself, but rather in its asymmetric distribution of resources between system itself; although can be interpreted as such, the fact is that this carcinogenesis had readjust what one system had been written on its DNA by the mother cell, replacing it with its own. Putting aside the morality, this redistribution happens positively speaking.

Now, this progress not merely happens at one event, as cancer does develop. When a cancer then infects and redistributes itself inside the body, it is called a Metastatis. It can do so because again, the resource had been purposefully misaligned to serve this new cancer; while still emitting its old code of a healthy system to other organs so that they still receive the same amount (or more amount) of nutrition. Other cell then, dies because they lack of needed nutrition, while the cancerous cell alienate other system from their supposed nutrition to preserve itself.

Now, let’s take a look at a real world example, a worker union with its member. At first, a worker union preserve its structural coupling with its member or other system, by representing the worker. But, when there’s an irritant to the Union (eg. Governmental threat), a worker union then no longer represents the worker, yet still act like it does, while in the background acting to please the key officials to preserve their existence/structure. It is called a Carcinogenesis or theft, because functionally speaking, the structural coupling that gives a system merit to extends its function and coherence to others by structurally aligning 2 or more parties at once, now become a parasite from its symbiotic relation, by the fact that the

mutilated system still has its merit on extending its function, while the decoupled one, gives some of its space and energy of self-reproduction to what it no longer receives the same amount of merit; since the code had been decoupled.
Now, when this Union then infects other variables and still alienate workers, it then become a cancerous variable that extracts the resources from the masses that is disillusioned, while still preserving the current ruler. The Ruler, in this case, is the biggest cancer of all, that infects other system to become cancerous on their own, to preserve its own legitimacy and merit without proper correspondence.

Carcinogenesis is then, when a system that self-reproduces its code through other irritant, and that evolution is structurally decoupled from previous iteration, which then transform another system's signal into a noise, to keep its self-reproduction functionally survive. To put it simply, it is when someone changes it internal logic to preserve their coherency in the face of a pressure, but still act like a hypocrite that tells you they are still the same good guys. A hypocrite is then comparable to that of a cancer.

What to do, then? If a state of governance is comparable to that of a cancerous cell? Or risk being one at hand? There's need to be a structural recoding from its foundation; a cell must be irritated enough to have its structure evolve in accordance with the irritant around it, and never be ossify. We must structure a system of governance in such a way that it evolve rather than become a cancer and ossify. There's need to be an apoptosis, a structured disappearance of redundancy within government to keep the structure anew and healthy. Institution must be designed in such a way that it can allow itself be redefined and destroyed indefinitely for the sake of greater evolutionary capabilities. A system must be able to get irritated, and thus evolve with it. And when the irritation demands it via redundancy of the state itself, a state must then kills itself for the sake of higher coherency of new structure; an anarchy through state, that can be rebooted if the situation demands it. The enemy then, is not a chaos, but static tyrant that risk becoming a cancer. Such is the vision of Irritocracy.

- Economic System

- Epilogue: Kintsugian Governance
  I want to clarify that I don't necessarily emphasize that the system should be built in accordance to this text, at least not systematically[5]. My goal here is to introduce a principle of law and governance in which, might be possible to be built, in a core principle that it is incomplete. We're not trying to build a perfect system here, as 'truth' or validity of a resolution at one point may differs in another point in time, and there'll be a difference in contexts; I instead, want to imagine a such of an incomplete governance that its sole purpose is to manage stability, while addressing the contradiction within the system with honesty and accountability. The role of the State is that it is a medium for a society to maintain stability

[5] As some of you might realize: I uses some of AI to structure this document coherently; so I expect some flaw in this document that I don't wish for some people to follow it *literally* like a holy book or something like that: read it, change it, and develop it.

amidst chaos; to decentralized prosperity and wealth of a nation towards her people in accordance to ‘what are they deserving of’. Albeit ‘Justice’ in this definition is abstract and unclear at some cases, I would like to keep it that way, so that the idea of prosperity and justice remains a dialogue rather than another dogma.

Some then might point out that this attempt is contain a risk of institutionalizing critique itself, therefore to neuter it even more; but that’s precisely why there’s need to be this kind of structure. What we want is not a closure where every form of critique is formalized; and I’m very much aware that there’ll be another binary of formal criticism/non-formal criticism that had been excluded. But to structure a system that acknowledge this kind of alienation would be a possibility in itself, that is still yet to be implemented in the real world. A system can’t be perfect, therefore it must evolve.

In this case, constructive criticism would be very welcomed, as this document itself are inherently incomplete; there must be something else I repress in the documentation of my thought, and it is better in my mind, that the reader would imagine and revise, how should a State of incompleteness itself develop. In fact, precisely because of friction itself the concept of Irritocracy might develop from various irritation and criticism. But the point of all of this isn’t to make it a closed system and thereby making a ‘perfect’ structure of society; I would emphasize it several times that the moment you try to make it a closed system (in this case an ideologically closed system), you had missed the point and thus producing another conventional form of a governance. It is precisely because of the incompleteness of a structure itself, through process of falsification, irritation, and criticism, this system might metabolize them into another new form, transcending this beta-structure.

My thought had led me into the previous conclusion, is that, the moment the Government were made so efficient because her contradiction would be tackled honestly, the people itself, through education, would naturally internalize the logic of a good governance; and thus, the need of an external governance would be redundant, and thus the last contradiction remains is the existence of State itself.

Although, it is better to emphasize that, we can never assume that at some point in time, that our quest for a better governance would stagnate. A vigilance here is much emphasized to avoid the trap of a ‘perfect’ closure, where a status quo become a demand. It is precisely at the moment when a system stops learning, a dangerous paradigm of a ‘final state’ become a dogma for the people, and thus oppression happens.

It is not through absoluteness of status quo we would stand in perfect unity; per Luhmann, a system is defined by its exclusion from the environment around them. My interpretation is that, any system by virtue of existing itself already alienate themselves from their environment. Just as we have explained in the introduction, a system by virtue of existing must alienate the noise outside itself, and collapse the Real into binary that can be understood via their own code. So here, any attempts to construct a perfect system is already impossible from the start by virtue of constructing a system itself. To make a system that accounts for everything that is, is to include a contradiction of reality around it; therefore, to erase the binary function of a system and thus, unmaking its structure.

That is to say, a system is Autopoietic; they self-reproduce themselves either by registering the noise into its own code – restructuring, like that of a language; or that they alienate more of the variables from themselves to remains coherent in the face of incommensurable noise – like in the case of where late-stage Capitalism, in which from each day, become more and more inconsistent on handling the societal problem, and instead of registering a real

contradiction and noises outside and restructuring, decide to alienate them further to maintains its coherency. Our goal is then, to irritate the system; amplifies the noise to the system to make it evolve according to the real contradiction that exists outside the code of the system. To make a structure ossifies is to make it betray the values within that had necessitate its creation in the first place. The true fidelity then, is to always restructure our system towards better structure via falsification and incompleteness without stopping by assuming finality.

But if unmaking of a structure is required to make them accounts for everything there is, why is there a need for making one in the first place? In which I might reply, maybe to a Deluzian or some Anarchists, is that **there will never be a pure deterritorialization or non-system**; or to put it simply, every deconstruction/deterritorialization is, in itself, a construct and territorialization.

Forgetting the case for a legal system; as Lacan put it, even human psyche itself is already barred from birth by the Real. I might appropriate some of the thinker's term to make my point, but let's consider for a moment, the reality of Quantum Physics. A thing is both wave and particle until measurement is imposed upon them, thus making them alienate other possibility into binary of wave/particle. Per Heisenberg's principle, we cannot know both the momentum and position of a particle at the same time. Here, to even 'know' something is already alienation between what it is not. A Knowing; Existence itself is an alienation of superposition of possibilities that might have been manifested. It is through differentiation we know something exists, and that is why, there will never be an 'outside-the-system', as some postmodernists or anarchists might propose it.

What's more dangerous from such notion is that, a system that tells you that it is a non-system, therefore it won't alienate like some other system. What's dangerous from said system is that, you won't get any clear justification of calculation of what is Justice or what if there is a repression under the name of 'non-system'? My answer is that, as soon as a coordination is made; or not-to-be made, a system would occur regardless, because it is on our nature to construct a system; not because we are evil per se, but ontologically speaking, this is how Human are conditioned in the first place.

We are already saw this kind of oppression happening in the times of Neo-liberal society in which, on the name of 'Freedom' and 'Non-system', an oppression are regardless occurs; even worse is that, now the justification of such acts were fragmented and imposed upon 'the will of the People', instead of in the past where we can point a finger of a corrupted Regime or Fascists that is a whole identity. With these consideration at hand, I think one must be honest in admitting that we will never be complete, and that system are what we are conditioned with in the first place. My assurance; or Hope is, that through perpetual falsification and evolution of system itself, an alienation might be at least pointed clearly, and restructuring are happening in the good side of our own kind. It is not through the illusion of non-system or complete system that we can get out of the system; but by honestly facing a struggle ahead, however uncomfortable it might be.

But what if I'm wrong? What if there is a perfect society somewhere, a perfect utopia in which, we can positively reach? Or worse, that all of this progress is impossible and just become the most beautiful illusion of all? In this case, even if my core assumption is wrong, an incomplete approach produces far better results than static absolutism. I would wage on progress through incompleteness rather than static absolutism, because it is on failure itself that we can learn and become better than yesterday, rather than assuming perfectness at the

first hindsight. Utopia is nice, but it is better to approach them incrementally rather than impose them outright prematurely. Whether this is right or wrong, this is still useful regardless. So whether you may or may not align with my views, the approach I offers can be applied universally for those who seeks progress.

The idea is this: even if this whole book would be ridiculed for its audacity or crude and naïve assumption of society itself, the spirit of Irritocracy would remain alive; because I assume that it would fail, and from this failure then comes critics, and from this irritant of Irritocracy itself, the system would naturally develops as human's ingenuity and imagination would goes on. Though personally, I may lack in the 'how to actually receive a critique and builds from it', or that the sheer amount of backlash would deter my determination to imagine an evolving society, let alone propose and design them nonetheless; or that I become too blind with my own structure that I betray my own value. Despite these concerns, I hope that the spirit behind Irritocracy would remains exists, even if the forms of it were to be alien to myself in the future. Because precisely because it will fail, it would evolve into something new. All hitherto values behind ideologies that promotes of progress and good life, were essentially Irritocrat in their spirit. However distinct the structure of the music is, it still comes from the same instrument of idea of a better world. From these failures however, it cannot be taken that the progress of humanity is essentially impossible from the start. Let us differentiate structure and value, and see how is that value emerge and evolving within many of its manifestation; leaving behind a redundant shell as it birth a new skin for it development.

There's a philosophy from Japan: Kintsugi. When a plate shatters or clipped, they would be reassembled with a new, gold-like glue so that the previously broken glass, would then become a better, more valuable glass rather than before its fraction. A crack, is a chance for a structure to evolve, and must be appreciated for the space of development it had provided and not for itself. Any cracks in the system therefore, at every iteration of its development, must cite what problem it tries to resolve beforehand, so that the value behind a structure remains visible. Let us see how our failures become golden cracks in our structure of governance, and let it broke again, so that we can rebuild it more beautiful; and with all the irony, let it then be destroyed again, so that another, better structure born anew, and so on.

But when will we actually know when to stop? I assume that, we will never. For as long as there's an incompleteness somewhere, even on the very identity of a human, the 'I' that excluding something, there'll always be a problem to work upon. Because when existence itself is an exclusion of something which is not, incompleteness would forever be applied as alienation is inherent in every form. When even observers alienate the quantum energy into one actuality over its superposition, and the world remains incomplete, the question then, what is our quest?

My answer then, is that our journey is not to strive towards perfection, but strive through the contradiction itself, indefinitely. Even if Zizek may question 'what if Progress itself is an illusion?', I would answer that: even if we know; and precisely because we know it is an illusion; that impossibility of reconciliation and progress is very much existent, I would like to move on regardless. There's a way, a better alternative, and static would be betrayal, a half-assed enjoyment in irony in which postmodernists had left some of us paralyzed in their worldview. At least, by being honest about our 'illusion', we can strive towards something, even when we don't know what it is; because its alternatives are a static tyrant. Because yes, it may be an illusion; but as long as we cannot get out from these illusion, we are nonetheless

bound by it. The question remains: what would you do with this illusion? Would you stand still on it? or move on regardless?

Will it be another ‘Utopia’ that is imposed and produces tyrant? I don’t know, but I know I want a book that can be rewritten indefinitely, according to our ‘needs’, whatever that may be. Because we move not because there is something that we had grasp in our hand, but because there is something else that may exist; the very impossibility and wants, and to dance with that impossibility of ideal in the face of chaotic world, and to stumble across the ballroom. But I think this is the very grace upon ourselves: that there’ll always be available space for us to explore, and that exploration would never be enough.

Perhaps, in the face of asymptotic journey, Sisyphus would never have his rock tumbling down, as there’ll no tip to catch upon. He will become better each day, ascending, transcending his past continuously. Perhaps, and I hope, that through this, we will able to experience infinity itself, through infinite struggle and happiness. Because as much as I want to avoid Utopia, it is regardless a nice dream to have while we suffer; and I want to at least make this suffering means something that is impossible.